



# NEWS RELEASE

Release Number: **S.C. 33/10**

Release Date: **August 20, 2010**

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF  
CALIFORNIA  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE  
OF THE COURTS  
Public Information Office  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688  
www.courtinfo.ca.gov

415-865-7740

Lynn Holton  
Public Information Officer

## Summary of Cases Accepted During the Week of August 16, 2010

*[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The statement of the issue or issues in each case set out below does not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]*

**#10-98 *Greb v. Diamond Internat. Corp., S183365.*** (A125472; 184 Cal.App.4th 15; San Francisco County Superior Court; 274989.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Does Corporations Code section 2010, which does not limit the time for bringing lawsuits against a dissolved corporation, apply to a dissolved foreign corporation, or does the corporate survival law of the state in which the foreign corporation was incorporated apply?

**#10-99 *Retired Employees Assn. v. County of Orange, S184059.*** (Ninth Cir. No. 09-56026; 610 F.3d 1099; Central District of California; No. SACV 07-1301 AG.) Request under California Rules of Court, rule 8.548, that this court decide questions of California law presented in a matter pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. As stated by the Ninth Circuit, the question presented is: “Whether, as a matter of California law, a California county and its employees can form an implied contract that confers vested rights to health benefits on retired county employees.”

**#10-100 *Serrano v. Stefan Merli Plastering Co., Inc., S183372.*** (B215837; 184 Cal.App.4th 178; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC324031.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying attorney fees in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Is plaintiff eligible for an award of attorney fees under the private attorney general doctrine based on a successful challenge to a court reporter’s service charges that established legal precedent?

**#10-101 *People v. Weber*, S184873.** (C060135; 185 Cal.App.4th 337; San Joaquin County Superior Court; SF105311A.) Review on the court's own motion after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Brown*, S181963 (#10-64), which presents the following issue: Does Penal Code section 4019, as amended to increase presentence custody credits for certain offenders, apply retroactively?

#