



Supreme Court of California  
350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102-4797  
[www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt](http://www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt)

**NEWS RELEASE**

Contact: [Cathal Conneely](mailto:Cathal.Conneely@courts.ca.gov), 415-865-7740

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

April 18, 2014

---

## Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions for Week of April 14, 2014

*[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.]*

**#14-40 *F.P. v. Monier, S216566.*** (C062329; 222 Cal.App.4th 1087; Sacramento County Superior Court; 06AS00671.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: Is a trial court's error in failing to issue a statement of decision upon a timely request reversible per se?

**#14-41 *Gaines v. Fidelity National Title Ins. Co., S215990.*** (B244961; 222 Cal.App.4th 25; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC361768.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Was this action properly dismissed for the failure to bring it to trial within five years or should the period during which the action was stayed for purposes of mediation have been excluded under Code of Civil Procedure section 583.340, subdivision (b) or (c)?

### **DISPOSITION**

The following case was transferred to the State Bar Court for reconsideration in light of *In re Glass* (2014) 58 Cal.4th 500:

**#13-49 *In re Alexander on Admission, S209148.***

## STATUS

**#13-08 Riverside County Sheriff's Dept. v. Stiglitz, S206350.** The court directed the parties to file supplemental letter briefs addressing the following questions:

(1) Assuming that a motion for discovery of officer personnel records may be filed in an administrative proceeding (Evid. Code, § 1043, subd. (a)), and a hearing officer has authority to determine that the motion states good cause for discovery (Evid. Code, § 1043, subd. (b)(3)), is there any existing statutory mechanism that would allow the matter to be transferred to the superior court for an in camera review of the records by a judicial officer (Evid. Code, § 1045, subd. (b))? (2) If no existing statutory mechanism applies, do we have the authority to create such a transfer mechanism?

# # #

*The Supreme Court of California is the state's highest court and its decisions are binding on all other California state courts. The court's primary role is to decide matters of statewide importance and to maintain uniformity in the law throughout California by reviewing matters from the six districts of the California Courts of Appeal and the fifty-eight county superior courts (the trial courts). Among its other duties, the court also decides all capital appeals and related matters and reviews both attorney and judicial disciplinary matters.*