



# NEWS RELEASE

Release Number: **S.C. 42/10**

Release Date: **October 22, 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 October 18, 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.]*

**#10-123 *Aryeh v. Canon Business Solutions, Inc., S184929.*** (B213104; 185 Cal.App.4th 1159; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC384674.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issues: (1) May the continuing violation doctrine, under which a defendant may be held liable for actions that take place outside the limitations period if those actions are sufficiently linked to unlawful conduct within the limitations period, be asserted in an action under the Unfair Competition Law (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17200 et seq.)? (2) May the continuous accrual doctrine, under which each violation of a periodic obligation or duty is deemed to give rise to a separate cause of action that accrues at the time of the individual wrong, be asserted in such an action? (3) May the delayed discovery rule, under which a cause of action does not accrue until a reasonable person in the plaintiff's position has actual or constructive knowledge of facts giving rise to a claim, be asserted in such an action?

**#10-124 *City of Alhambra v. County of Los Angeles, S185457.*** (B218347; 186 Cal.App.4th 537; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BS116375.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in an action for writ of administrative mandate. This case presents the following issue: Does Revenue and Taxation Code section 97.75 prohibit a county from taking into account property tax revenues diverted from the county's Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund to a city under sections 97.68 and 97.70 when determining, pursuant to section 95.3, the city's share of costs incurred by the county in the assessment, collection, and allocation of property taxes?