Judicial Council of California • Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688
www.courts.ca.gov/policyadmin-invitationstocomment.htm

INVITATION TO COMMENT

CACI16-01

Title
Civil Jury Instructions (CACI) Revisions

Action Requested
Review and submit comments by March 4, 2016

Proposed Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes
Add and revise jury instructions and verdict forms

Proposed Effective Date
June 24, 2016

Proposed by
Advisory Committee on Civil Jury Instructions
Hon. Martin J. Tangeman, Chair

Contact
Bruce Greenlee, Attorney, 415-865-7698
bruce.greenlee@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary and Origin

The Judicial Council Advisory Committee on Civil Jury Instructions has posted proposed revisions and additions to the Judicial Council civil jury instructions (CACI). Under Rule 10.58 of the California Rules of Court, the advisory committee is responsible for regularly reviewing case law and statutes affecting jury instructions and making recommendations to the Judicial Council for updating, revising, and adding topics to the council's civil jury instructions. On approval by the Judicial Council, all changes will be published in the supplement to the 2016 edition of the official LexisNexis CACI publication.

Request for Specific Comments

The advisory committee is again proposing revisions and a slight title change to CACI No. 2334, which would be renamed: *Bad Faith (Third Party)—**Failure** to Accept Reasonable Settlement Within Liability Policy Limits—Essential Factual Elements*. The proposed changes are similar, but not identical, to those proposed in 2015. On receipt of the many comments submitted last year, consideration of changes to this instruction was deferred for additional deliberation. The reasons why the committee deferred recommendation of changes to this instruction in 2015 are presented at page 6 of the committee's report to the Judicial Council for its December 11, 2015 meeting. The committee report may be found at https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4165537&GUID=5AE35403-86B1-425B-85FF-0395E5D41154

The committee is particularly interested in comments on the following:

- The proposed changes to the last paragraph of the instruction;
- Specific examples of cases in which the reasonableness of the insurer's failure to accept a policy-limits offer was asserted by the defense, and the basis for the claim of reasonableness (regardless of whether the claim was permitted or rejected by the court).

The advisory committee is particularly interested in learning whether there are cases in which the insurer alleges a reasonable rejection for reasons other than its evaluation of liability and damages.

Attachments

Proposed revised and new instructions and verdict forms: pp. 6–139

CIVIL JURY INSTRUCTIONS (CACI16–01)
TABLE OF CONTENTS

426. Negligent Hiring, Supervision, or Retention of Employee

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [he/she] was harmed by [***name of employee***] and that [***name of employer defendant***] is responsible for that harm because [***name of employer defendant***] negligently [hired/ supervised/ [or] retained] [***name of employee***]. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **[That [***name of employer defendant***] hired [***name of employee***];]**

2. **That [***name of employee***] [[was/became] [unfit/ [or] incompetent]***/other particular risk***] to perform the work for which [he/she] was hired;**

3. **That [***name of employer defendant***] knew or should have known that [***name of employee***] [[was/became] [unfit/ [or] incompetent]***/other particular risk***] and that this [[unfitness/ [or] incompetence]***/other particular risk***] created a particular risk to others;**

4. **That [***name of employee***]'s [[unfitness/ [or] incompetence]***/other particular risk***] harmed [***name of plaintiff***]; and**

5. **That [***name of employer defendant***]'s negligence in [hiring/ supervising/ [or] retaining] [***name of employee***] was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

New December 2009; Revised December 2015, June 2016

Directions for Use

Give this instruction if the plaintiff alleges that the employer of an employee who caused harm was negligent in the hiring, supervision, or retention of the employee after actual or constructive notice ~~of~~ that the employee created a particular risk or hazard to others~~'s unfitness~~. For instructions holding the employer vicariously liable (without fault) for the acts of the employee, see the Vicarious Responsibility series, CACI No. 3700 et seq.

Include optional question 1 if the employment relationship between the defendant and the negligent person is contested. (See *Jackson v. AEG Live, LLC* (2015) 233 Cal.App.4th 1156, 1185−1189 [183 Cal.Rptr.3d 394].) It appears that liability may also be imposed on the hirer of an independent contractor for the negligent selection of the contractor. (See *Noble v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.* (1973) 33 Cal.App.3d 654, 662–663 [109 Cal.Rptr. 269].) Therefore, it would not seem to be necessary to instruct on the test to determine whether the relationship is one of employer-employee or hirer-independent contractor. (See CACI No. 3704, *Existence of "Employee" Status Disputed*.)

Choose "became" in elements 2 and 3 in a claim for negligent retention.

In most cases, "unfitness" or "incompetence" (or both) will adequately describe the particular risk that

the employee represents. However, there may be cases in which neither word adequately describes the risk that the employer should have known about.

Sources and Authority

- "California case law recognizes the theory that an employer can be liable to a third person for negligently hiring, supervising, or retaining an unfit employee." (*Doe v. Capital Cities* (1996) 50 Cal.App.4th 1038, 1054 [58 Cal.Rptr.2d 122].)

- "Negligence liability will be imposed on an employer if it 'knew or should have known that hiring the employee created a particular risk or hazard and that particular harm materializes.' " (*Phillips v. TLC Plumbing, Inc.* (2009) 172 Cal.App.4th 1133, 1139 [91 Cal.Rptr.3d 864].)

- "Liability for negligent supervision and/or retention of an employee is one of direct liability for negligence, not vicarious liability." (*Delfino v. Agilent Technologies, Inc.* (2006) 145 Cal.App.4th 790, 815 [52 Cal.Rptr.3d 376].)

- "Liability for negligent hiring and supervision is based upon the reasoning that if an enterprise hires individuals with characteristics which might pose a danger to customers or other employees, the enterprise should bear the loss caused by the wrongdoing of its incompetent or unfit employees. The tort has developed in California in factual settings where the plaintiff's injury occurred in the workplace, or the contact between the plaintiff and the employee was generated by the employment relationship." (*Mendoza v. City of Los Angeles* (1998) 66 Cal.App.4th 1333, 1339–1340 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 525].)

- "To establish negligent supervision, a plaintiff must show that a person in a supervisorial position over the actor had prior knowledge of the actor's propensity to do the bad act." (*Z.V. v. County of Riverside* (2015) 238 Cal.App.4th 889, 902 [189 Cal.Rptr.3d 570]~~We are cited to no authority, nor have we found any authority basing liability on lack of, or on inadequate, supervision, in the absence of knowledge by the principal that the agent or servant was a person who could not be trusted to act properly without being supervised." (*Noble*, *supra*, 33 Cal.App.3d at p. 664~~.)

- "Apparently, [defendant] had no actual knowledge of [the employee]'s past. But the evidence recounted above presents triable issues of material fact regarding whether the [defendant] had reason to believe [the employee] was unfit or whether the [defendant] failed to use reasonable care in investigating [the employee]." (*Evan F. v. Hughson United Methodist Church* (1992) 8 Cal.App.4th 828, 843 [10 Cal.Rptr.2d 748]; cf. *Flores v. AutoZone West Inc.* (2008) 161 Cal.App.4th 373, 384–386 [74 Cal.Rptr.3d 178] [employer had no duty to investigate and discover that job applicant had a juvenile delinquency record].)

- "A claim that an employer was negligent in hiring or retaining an employee-driver rarely differs in substance from a claim that an employer was negligent in entrusting a vehicle to the employee. Awareness, constructive or actual, that a person is unfit or incompetent to drive underlies a claim that an employer was negligent in hiring or retaining that person as a driver. (See Judicial Council of Cal. Civ. Jury Instns. (2011) CACI No. 426.) That same awareness underlies a claim for negligent entrustment. (See CACI No. 724.) In a typical case, like this, the two claims are

functionally identical." (*Diaz v. Carcamo* (2011) 51 Cal.4th 1148, 1157 [126 Cal.Rptr.3d 443, 253 P.3d 535].)

- "[I]f an employer admits vicarious liability for its employee's negligent driving in the scope of employment, 'the damages attributable to both employer and employee will be coextensive.' Thus, when a plaintiff alleges a negligent entrustment or hiring cause of action against the employer and the employer admits vicarious liability for its employee's negligent driving, the universe of defendants who can be held responsible for plaintiff's damages is reduced by one—the employer—for purposes of apportioning fault under Proposition 51. Consequently, the employer would not be mentioned on the special verdict form. The jury must divide fault for the accident among the listed tortfeasors, and the employer is liable only for whatever share of fault the jury assigns to the employee." (*Diaz, supra*, 41 Cal.4th at p. 1159, internal citations omitted.)

- "[A] public school district may be vicariously liable under [Government Code] section 815.2 for the negligence of administrators or supervisors in hiring, supervising and retaining a school employee who sexually harasses and abuses a student." (*C.A. v. William S. Hart Union High School Dist.* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 861, 879 [138 Cal.Rptr.3d 1, 270 P.3d 699].)

- "[P]laintiff premises her direct negligence claim on the hospital's alleged failure to properly screen [doctor] before engaging her and to properly supervise her after engaging her. Since hiring and supervising medical personnel, as well as safeguarding incapacitated patients, are clearly within the scope of services for which the hospital is licensed, its alleged failure to do so necessarily states a claim for professional negligence. Accordingly, plaintiff cannot pursue a claim of direct negligence against the hospital." (*So v. Shin* (2013) 212 Cal.App.4th 652, 668 [151 Cal.Rptr.3d 257].)

- "[Asking] whether [defendant] hired [employee] was necessary given the dispute over who hired [employee]—[defendant] or [decedent]. As the trial court noted, 'The employment was neither stipulated nor obvious on its face.' However, if the trial court began the jury instructions or special verdict form with, 'Was [employee] unfit or incompetent to perform the work for which he was hired,' confusion was likely to result as the question assumed a hiring. Therefore, the jury needed to answer the question of whether [defendant] hired [employee] before it could determine if [defendant] negligently hired, retained, or supervised him." (*Jackson, supra*, 233 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1187−1188.)

Secondary Sources

6 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, § 1190

Chin et al., California Practice Guide: Employment Litigation, Ch. 5-H, *Negligence,* ¶ 5:615 et seq. (The Rutter Group)

3 California Torts, Ch. 40B, *Employment Discrimination and Harassment,* § 40B.21 (Matthew Bender)

21 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 248, *Employer's Liability for Employee's Torts*, § 248.12 (Matthew Bender)

10 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 100A, *Employer and Employee: Respondeat Superior*, § 100A.22 (Matthew Bender)

440. Unreasonable Force by Law Enforcement Officer in Arrest or Other Seizure—Essential Factual Elements

---

A law enforcement officer may use reasonable force to [arrest/detain] a person when he or she has reasonable cause to believe that that person has committed or is committing a crime. However, the officer may use only that degree of force necessary to accomplish the [arrest/detention].

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] used unreasonable force in [arresting/detaining] [him/her] To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] used force in [arresting/detaining] [***name of plaintiff***];**

2. **That the amount of force used by [***name of defendant***] was unreasonable;**

4. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

5. **That [***name of defendant***]'s use of unreasonable force was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

In deciding whether [*name of defendant***] used unreasonable force, you must consider all of the circumstances of the [arrest/detention] and determine what force a reasonable [***insert type of peace officer***] in [***name of defendant***]'s position would have used under the same or similar circumstances. Among the factors to be considered are the following:**

(a) Whether [*name of plaintiff***] reasonably appeared to pose an immediate threat to the safety of [***name of defendant***] or others;**

(b) The seriousness of the crime at issue;

(c) Whether [*name of plaintiff***] was actively resisting [arrest/detention] or attempting to avoid [arrest/detention] by flight[; and/.]**

[(d) [*Name of defendant***]'s tactical conduct and decisions before using [deadly] force on [***name of plaintiff***].]**

New June 2016

Directions for Use

Use this instruction if the plaintiff makes a negligence claim under state law arising from the force used in effecting an arrest or detention. Such a claim is often combined with a claimed civil rights violation under 42 United States Code section 1983 (See CACI No. 3020, *Excessive Use of Force—Unreasonable Arrest or Other Seizure—Essential Factual Elements.* It might also be combined with a claim for battery. See CACI No. 1305, *Battery by Peace Officer*. For additional authorities on excessive force by a law

enforcement officer, see the Sources and Authority to these two CACI instructions.

Factors (a), (b), and (c) are often referred to as the "Graham factors." (See *Graham v. Connor* (1989) 490 U.S. 386, 396 [109 S.Ct. 1865, 104 L.Ed.2d 443].) The Graham factors are to be applied under California negligence law. (*Hernandez v. City of Pomona* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 501, 514 [94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1, 207 P.3d 506].) They are not exclusive; (see *Glenn v. Wash. County* (9th Cir. 2011) 661 F.3d 460, 467–468.); additional factors may be added if appropriate to the facts of the case. If negligence, civil rights, and battery claims are all involved, the instructions can be combined so as to give the *Graham* factors only once. A sentence may be added to advise the jury that the factors apply to all three claims.

Give optional factor (d) if the officer's conduct leading up to the need to use force is at issue. Liability can arise if the earlier tactical conduct and decisions show, as part of the totality of circumstances, that the ultimate use of force was unreasonable. In this respect, California negligence law differs from the federal standard under the Fourth Amendment. (*Hayes v. County of San Diego* (2014) 57 Cal. 4th 622, 639 [160 Cal.Rptr.3d 684, 305 P.3d 252].)

Sources and Authority

- Use of Reasonable Force to Arrest. California Penal Code section 835a.

- "Consistent with these principles and the factors the high court has identified, the federal court in this case did not instruct the jury to conduct some abstract or nebulous balancing of competing interests. Instead, as noted above, it instructed the jury to determine the reasonableness of the officers' actions in light of 'the totality of the circumstances at the time,' including 'the severity of the crime at issue, whether the plaintiff posed a reasonable threat to the safety of the officer or others, and whether the plaintiff was actively resisting detention or attempting to escape.' The same consideration of the totality of the circumstances is required in determining reasonableness under California negligence law. Moreover, California's civil jury instructions specifically direct the jury, in determining whether police officers used unreasonable force for purposes of tort liability, to consider the same factors that the high court has identified and that the federal court's instructions in this case set forth. (Judicial Council of Cal. Civ. Jury Instns. (2008) CACI No. 1305.) Thus, plaintiffs err in arguing that the federal and state standards of reasonableness differ in that the former involves a fact finder's balancing of competing interests." (*Hernandez, supra,* 46 Cal.4th at p. 514, internal citation omitted.)

- "Determining whether the force used to effect a particular seizure is 'reasonable' under the Fourth Amendment requires a careful balancing of ' "the nature and quality of the intrusion on the individual's Fourth Amendment interests" ' against the countervailing governmental interests at stake. Our Fourth Amendment jurisprudence has long recognized that the right to make an arrest or investigatory stop necessarily carries with it the right to use some degree of physical coercion or threat thereof to effect it. Because '[t]he test of reasonableness under the Fourth Amendment is not capable of precise definition or mechanical application,' however, its proper application requires careful attention to the facts and circumstances of each particular case, including the severity of the crime at issue, whether the suspect poses an immediate threat to the safety of the officers or others, and whether he is actively resisting arrest or attempting to evade arrest by flight." (*Graham, supra,* 490 U.S. at p. 396, internal citations omitted.)

- "The most important of these [*Graham* factors, above] is whether the suspect posed an immediate threat to the officers or others, as measured objectively under the circumstances." (*Mendoza v. City of West Covina* (2012) 206 Cal.App.4th 702, 712 [141 Cal.Rptr.3d 553].)

- "Plaintiff must prove unreasonable force as an element of the tort." (*Edson v. City of Anaheim* (1998) 63 Cal.App.4th 1269, 1272 [74 Cal.Rptr.2d 614].)

- " ' "The 'reasonableness' of a particular use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene, rather than with the 20/20 vision of hindsight. … [T]he question is whether the officers' actions are 'objectively reasonable' in light of the facts and circumstances confronting them, without regard to their underlying intent or motivation. …" ' In calculating whether the amount of force was excessive, a trier of fact must recognize that peace officers are often forced to make split-second judgments, in tense circumstances, concerning the amount of force required." (*Brown v. Ransweiler* (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 516, 527–528 [89 Cal.Rptr.3d 801], internal citations omitted.)

- " '[A]s long as an officer's conduct falls within the range of conduct that is reasonable under the circumstances, there is no requirement that he or she choose the "most reasonable" action or the conduct that is the least likely to cause harm and at the same time the most likely to result in the successful apprehension of a violent suspect, in order to avoid liability for negligence.' " (*Hayes v. County of San Diego* (2014) 57 Cal. 4th 622, 632 [160 Cal. Rptr. 3d 684, 305 P.3d 252].)

- "A police officer's use of deadly force is reasonable if ' " 'the officer has probable cause to believe that the suspect poses a significant threat of death or serious physical injury to the officer or others.' …" …' " (*Brown, supra,* 171 Cal.App.4th at p. 528.)

- "Law enforcement personnel's tactical conduct and decisions preceding the use of deadly force are relevant considerations under California law in determining whether the use of deadly force gives rise to negligence liability. Such liability can arise, for example, if the tactical conduct and decisions show, as part of the totality of circumstances, that the use of deadly force was unreasonable." (*Hayes, supra,* 57 Cal.4th at p. 639.)

Secondary Sources

450C. Negligent Undertaking

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] is responsible for [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm because [***name of defendant***] failed to exercise reasonable care to protect [***name of third person***]. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. That [*name of defendant***], voluntarily or for a charge, took steps for the protection of [***name of third person***];**

2. That these steps were of a kind that [*name of defendant***] should have recognized as needed for the protection of [***name of plaintiff***];**

3. That [*name of defendant***] failed to exercise reasonable care in taking these steps;**

4. That [*name of defendant***]'s failure to exercise reasonable care was a substantial factor in causing harm to [***name of plaintiff***]; and**

5. [(a) That [*name of defendant***]'s failure to use reasonable care added to the risk of harm;]**

[or]

[(b) That [*name of defendant***]'s steps were taken to perform a duty that [***name of third person***] owed to third persons including [***name of plaintiff***];]**

[or]

[(c) That [*name of plaintiff***] suffered harm because [***name of third person/* **[or] [***name of plaintiff***] relied on [***name of defendant***]'s steps.]**

New June 2016

Directions for Use

This instruction presents the theory of liability known as the "negligent undertaking" rule. (See Restatement Second of Torts, section 324A.) The elements are stated in *Paz v. State of California* (2000) 22 Cal.4th 550; 553 [93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 703, 994 P.2d 975].

In *Paz,* the court said that negligent undertaking is "sometimes referred to as the 'Good Samaritan' rule," by which a person generally has no duty to come to the aid of another and cannot be liable for doing so unless the person aiding's acts increased the risk to the person aided or the person aided relied on the person aiding's acts. (*Paz, supra,* 22 Cal.4th at p. 553; see CACI No. 450A, *Good Samaritan—Nonemergency*) It is perhaps more accurate to say that negligent undertaking is another application of the Good Samaritan rule. CACI No. 450A is for use in a case in which the person aided is

the injured plaintiff. (See Restatement 2d of Torts, § 323.) This instruction is for use in a case in which the defendant's failure to exercise reasonable care in acting to aid one person has resulted in harm to another person.

Select one or more of the three options for element 5 depending on the facts.

Sources and Authority

- Negligent Undertaking. Restatement Second of Torts section 324A.

- "Under well-established common law principles, a person has no duty to come to the aid of another. If, however, a person elects to come to someone's aid, he or she has a duty to exercise due care. Thus, a 'good Samaritan' who attempts to help someone might be liable if he or she does not exercise due care and ends up causing harm." (*Van Horn v. Watson* (2008) 45 Cal.4th 322, 324 [86 Cal.Rptr.3d 350, 197 P.3d 164], internal citations omitted.)

- "[T]he [Restatement Second of Torts] section 324A theory of liability--sometimes referred to as the "Good Samaritan" rule--is a settled principle firmly rooted in the common law of negligence. Section 324A prescribes the conditions under which a person who undertakes to render services for another may be liable to third persons for physical harm resulting from a failure to act with reasonable care. Liability may exist if (a) the failure to exercise reasonable care increased the risk of harm, (b) the undertaking was to perform a duty the other person owed to the third persons, or (c) the harm was suffered because the other person or the third persons relied on the undertaking." (*Paz, supra,* 22 Cal.4th at p. 553.)

- "Thus, as the traditional theory is articulated in the Restatement, and as we have applied it in other contexts, a negligent undertaking claim of liability to third parties requires evidence that: (1) the actor undertook, gratuitously or for consideration, to render services to another; (2) the services rendered were of a kind the actor should have recognized as necessary for the protection of third persons; (3) the actor failed to exercise reasonable care in the performance of the undertaking; (4) the actor's failure to exercise reasonable care resulted in physical harm to the third persons; and (5) either (a) the actor's carelessness increased the risk of such harm, or (b) the actor undertook to perform a duty that the other owed to the third persons, or (c) the harm was suffered because either the other or the third persons relied on the actor's undertaking.[¶] Section 324A's negligent undertaking theory of liability subsumes the well-known elements of any negligence action, viz., duty, breach of duty, proximate cause, and damages." (*Paz, supra,* 22 Cal.4th at p. 559, internal citation omitted; see also *Scott v. C. R. Bard, Inc.* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 763, 775 [180 Cal.Rptr.3d 479] [jury properly instructed on elements as set forth above in *Paz*].)

- "The general rule is that a person who has not created a peril is not liable in tort for failing to take affirmative action to protect another unless they have some relationship that gives rise to a duty to act. However, one who undertakes to aid another is under a duty to exercise due care in acting and is liable if the failure to do so increases the risk of harm or if the harm is suffered because the other relied on the undertaking. Section 324A integrates these two basic principles in its rule." (*Paz. supra,* 22 Cal.4th at pp. 558−559.)

- "[T]he 'negligent undertaking' doctrine, like the special relationship doctrine, is an exception to the 'no duty to aid' rule." (*Conti v. Watchtower Bible & Tract Society of New York, Inc.* (2015) 235 Cal.App.4th 1214, 1231 [186 Cal.Rptr.3d 26].)

- "Under the good Samaritan doctrine, CHP may have a duty to members of the public to exercise due care when CHP voluntarily assumes a protective duty toward a certain member of the public and undertakes action on behalf of that member thereby inducing reliance, when an express promise to warn of a danger has induced reliance, or when the actions of CHP place a person in peril or increase the risk of harm. In other words, to create a special relationship and a duty of care, there must be evidence that CHP ' "made misrepresentations that induced a citizen's detrimental reliance [citation], placed a citizen in harm's way [citations], or lulled a citizen into a false sense of security and then withdrew essential safety precautions." ' Nonfeasance that leaves the citizen in exactly the same position that he or she already occupied cannot support a finding of duty of care. Affirmative conduct or misfeasance on the part of CHP that induces reliance or changes the risk of harm is required." (*Greyhound Lines, Inc. v. Department of the California Highway Patrol* (2013) 213 Cal.App.4th 1129, 1136 [152 Cal.Rptr.3d 492], internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

4 Witkin, California Procedure (4th ed. 1996) Pleadings, § 553

6 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, §§ 1060–1065

Flahavan et al., California Practice Guide: Personal Injury (The Rutter Group) ¶¶ 2:583.10–2:583.11, 2:876

1 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 1, *Negligence: Duty and Breach*, § 1.11 (Matthew Bender)

4 California Trial Guide, Unit 90, *Closing Argument*, § 90.90 (Matthew Bender)

33 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 380, *Negligence*, § 380.32[5][c] (Matthew Bender)

16 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 165, *Negligence*, § 165.150 (Matthew Bender)

461. Strict Liability for Injury Caused by Wild Animal—Essential Factual Elements

---

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***]'s [***insert type of animal***] harmed [him/her] and that [***name of defendant***] is responsible for that harm.**

People who own, keep, or control wild animals are responsible for the harm that these animals cause to others, no matter how carefully they guard or restrain their animals.

To establish [his/her] claim, [*name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] owned, kept, or controlled [a/an] [***insert type of animal***];**

2. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

3. **That [***name of defendant***]'s [***insert type of animal***] was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

New September 2003; Revised December 2015, June 2016

Directions for Use

Give this instruction to impose strict liability on an animal owner for injuries caused by an animal of a type that is inherently dangerous without the need to show the owner's knowledge of dangerousness. (See *Baugh v. Beatty* (1949) 91 Cal.App.2d 786, 791–792 [205 P.2d 671].) For an instruction for use for a domestic animal if it is alleged that the owner knew or should have known that the animal had a dangerous propensity, see CACI No. 462, *Strict Liability for Injury Caused by Domestic Animal With Dangerous Propensity*. (See *Thomas v. Stenberg* (2012) 206 Cal.App.4th 654, 665 [142 Cal.Rptr.3d 24].) For an instruction on statutory strict liability under the dog-bite statute, see CACI No. 463, *Dog Bite Statute—Essential Factual Elements.*

Whether the determination that the animal that caused injury is a "wild animal" triggering this instruction is a matter of law for the court or can be a question of fact for the jury has apparently not been addressed by the courts.

Sources and Authority

- "The keeper of an animal of a species dangerous by nature … is liable, without wrongful intent or negligence, for damage to others resulting from such a propensity. The liability of the keeper is absolute, for '[the] gist of the action is not the manner of keeping the vicious animal, but the keeping him at all with knowledge of the vicious propensities. [Citation.] In such instances the owner is an insurer against the acts of the animal, to one who is injured without fault, and the question of the owner's negligence is not in the case.' " (*Hillman v. Garcia-Ruby* (1955) 44 Cal.2d 625, 626 [283 P.2d 1033].)

- "[I]f the animal which inflicted the injury is vicious and dangerous, known to the defendant to be such, an allegation of negligence on the part of defendant is unnecessary and the averment, if made, may be treated as surplusage." (*Baugh*, *supra*, ~~*v. Beatty* (1949)~~ 91 Cal.App.2d at p.~~786,~~ 791 ~~[205 P.2d 671]~~.)

- "[A] wild animal is presumed to be vicious and since the owner of such an animal … is an insurer against the acts of the animal to anyone who is injured, and unless such person voluntarily or consciously does something which brings the injury on himself, the question of the owner's negligence is not in the case." *Baugh, supra,* 91 Cal.App.2d at p. 791.)

- "The court instructed the jury with respect to the liability of the keeper of a vicious or dangerous animal, known to be such by its owner. Although plaintiff has not raised any objection to this instruction, it was not proper in the instant case since the animal was of the class of animals *ferae naturae,* of known savage and vicious nature, and hence an instruction on the owner's knowledge of its ferocity was unnecessary." (*Baugh, supra,* 91 Cal.App.2d at pp. 791–792.)

- "[Strict] liability has been imposed on 'keepers of lions and tigers, bears, elephants, wolves [and] monkeys.' " (*Rosenbloom v. Hanour Corp.* (1998) 66 Cal.App.4th 1477, 1479, fn. 1 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 686].)

- "The owner of a naturally dangerous animal may be excused from the usual duty of care: 'In cases involving "primary assumption of risk"—where, by virtue of the nature of the activity and the parties' relationship to the activity, the defendant owes no legal duty to protect the plaintiff from the particular risk of harm that caused the injury—the doctrine ... operates as a complete bar to the plaintiff's recovery.' " (*Rosenbloom, supra,* 66 Cal.App.4th at p. 1479, internal citation omitted.)

Secondary Sources

6 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, § 1403

California Tort Guide (Cont.Ed.Bar 3d ed.) §§ 3.3-3.6

1 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 6, *Strict Liability for Injuries Caused by Animals,* §§ 6.01-6.10 (Matthew Bender)

3 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 23, *Animals: Civil Liability,* § 23.23 (Matthew Bender)

1 California Civil Practice: Torts §§ 2:20–2:21 (Thomson Reuters)

1100. Dangerous Condition on Public Property—Essential Factual Elements (Gov. Code, § 835)

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [he/she] was harmed by a dangerous condition of [***name of defendant***]'s property. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] owned [or controlled] the property;**

2. **That the property was in a dangerous condition at the time of the incident;**

3. **That the dangerous condition created a reasonably foreseeable risk of the kind of ~~incident~~ injury that occurred;**

4. **[That negligent or wrongful conduct of [***name of defendant***]'s employee acting within the scope of his or her employment created the dangerous condition;]**

   [or]

   [That [*name of defendant***] had notice of the dangerous condition for a long enough time to have protected against it;]**

5. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

6. **That the dangerous condition was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

New September 2003; Revised October 2008, June 2016

Directions for Use

For element 4, choose either or both options depending on whether liability is alleged under Government Code section 835(a), 835(b), or both.

See also CACI No. 1102, *Definition of "Dangerous Condition,"* and CACI No. 1103, *Notice*.

Sources and Authority

- Liability of Public Entity for Dangerous Condition of Property. Government Code section 835.
- Actual Notice. Government Code section 835.2(a).
- Constructive Notice. Government Code section 835.2(b).
- Definitions. Government Code section 830.

- 'The Government Claims Act (§ 810 et seq.; the Act) 'is a comprehensive statutory scheme that sets forth the liabilities and immunities of public entities and public employees for torts.' Section 835 … prescribes the conditions under which a public entity may be held liable for injuries caused by a dangerous condition of public property. Section 835 provides that a public entity may be held liable for such injuries 'if the plaintiff establishes that the property was in a dangerous condition at the time of the injury, that the injury was proximately caused by the dangerous condition, [and] that the dangerous condition created a reasonably foreseeable risk of the kind of injury which was incurred.' In addition, the plaintiff must establish that either: (a) '[a] negligent or wrongful act or omission of an employee of the public entity within the scope of his employment created the dangerous condition,' or (b) '[t]he public entity had . . . notice of the dangerous condition . . . a sufficient time prior to the injury to have taken measures to protect against the dangerous condition.' " (*Cordova v. City of Los Angeles* (2015) 61 Cal.4th 1099, 1104 [190 Cal.Rptr.3d 850, 353 P.3d 773], internal citations omitted.)

- "[A] public entity may be liable for a dangerous condition of public property even when the immediate cause of a plaintiff's injury is a third party's negligent or illegal act (such as a motorist's negligent driving), if some physical characteristic of the property exposes its users to increased danger from third party negligence or criminality. Public entity liability lies under section 835 when some feature of the property increased or intensified the danger to users from third party conduct." (*Castro v. City of Thousand Oaks* (2015) 239 Cal.App.4th 1451, 1457−1458 [192 Cal.Rptr.3d 376], internal citation omitted.)

- "Subdivisions (a) and (b) of section 835 obviously address two different types of cases. However, what distinguishes the two types of cases is not simply whether the public entity has notice of the dangerous condition. Instead, what distinguishes the two cases in practice is who created the dangerous condition. Because an entity must act through its employees, virtually all suits brought on account of dangerous conditions created by the entity will be brought under subdivision (a). In contrast, subdivision (b) can also support suits based on dangerous conditions not created by the entity or its employees." (*Brown v. Poway Unified School Dist.* (1993) 4 Cal.4th 820, 836 [15 Cal.Rptr.2d 679, 843 P.2d 624].)

- "[T]he res ipsa loquitur presumption does not satisfy the requirements for holding a public entity liable under section 835, subdivision (a). Res ipsa loquitur requires the plaintiff to show only (1) that the accident was of a kind which ordinarily does not occur in the absence of negligence, (2) that the instrumentality of harm was within the defendant's exclusive control, and (3) that the plaintiff did not voluntarily contribute to his or her own injuries. Subdivision (a), in contrast, requires the plaintiff to show that an employee of the public entity 'created' the dangerous condition; in view of the legislative history … ,the term 'created' must be defined as the sort of involvement by an employee that would justify a presumption of notice on the entity's part." (*Brown, supra*, 4 Cal.4th at p. 836.)

- "Focusing on the language in *Pritchard, supra*, 178 Cal. App. 2d at page 256, stating that where the public entity 'has itself created the dangerous condition it is per se culpable,' plaintiff argues that the negligence that section 835, subdivision (a), refers to is not common law negligence, but something that exists whenever the public entity creates the dangerous condition of property. We disagree. If the Legislature had wanted to impose liability whenever a public entity created a dangerous condition, it

would merely have required plaintiff to establish that an act or omission of an employee of the public entity within the scope of his employment created the dangerous condition. Instead, section 835, subdivision (a), requires the plaintiff to establish that a '*negligent or wrongful* act or omission of an employee of the public entity within the scope of his employment created the dangerous condition.' (Italics added.) Plaintiff's interpretation would transform the highly meaningful words 'negligent or wrongful' into meaningless surplusage, contrary to the rule of statutory interpretation that courts should avoid a construction that makes any word surplusage." (*Metcalf v. County of San Joaquin* (2008) 42 Cal.4th 1121, 1135 [72 Cal.Rptr.3d 382, 176 P.2d 654], original italics, internal citation omitted.)

- "In order to recover under Government Code section 835, it is not necessary for plaintiff to prove a negligent act *and* notice; either negligence *or* notice will suffice." (*Curtis v. State of California* (1982) 128 Cal.App.3d 668, 693 [180 Cal.Rptr. 843], original italics.)

- "For liability to be imposed on a public entity for a dangerous condition of property, the entity must be in a position to protect against or warn of the hazard. Therefore, the crucial element is not ownership, but rather control." (*Mamola v. State of California ex rel. Dept. of Transportation* (1979) 94 Cal.App.3d 781, 788 [156 Cal.Rptr. 614], internal citation omitted.)

- "Liability for injury caused by a dangerous condition of property has been imposed when an unreasonable risk of harm is created by a combination of defect in the property and acts of third parties. However, courts have consistently refused to characterize harmful third party conduct as a dangerous condition-absent some concurrent contributing defect in the property itself." (*Hayes v. State of California* (1974) 11 Cal.3d 469, 472 [113 Cal.Rptr. 599, 521 P.2d 855], internal citations omitted.)

- "[P]laintiffs in this case must show that a dangerous condition of property--that is, a condition that creates a substantial risk of injury to the public--proximately caused the fatal injuries their decedents suffered as a result of the collision with [third party]'s car. But nothing in the statute requires plaintiffs to show that the allegedly dangerous condition also caused the third party conduct that precipitated the accident." (*Cordova, supra,* 61 Cal. 4th at p. 1106.)

- "The existence of a dangerous condition is ordinarily a question of fact but 'can be decided as a matter of law if reasonable minds can come to only one conclusion.' " (*Cerna v. City of Oakland* (2008) 161 Cal.App.4th 1340, 1347 [75 Cal.Rptr.3d 168].)

Secondary Sources

5 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, §§ 249–285

Friedman et al., California Practice Guide: Landlord-Tenant, Ch. 6-C, *Immunity From Liability*, ¶ 6:91 et seq. (The Rutter Group)

Hanning et al., California Practice Guide: Personal Injury, Ch. 2(III)-D, *Liability For "Dangerous Conditions" Of Public Property*, ¶ 2:2785 et seq. (The Rutter Group)

2 California Government Tort Liability Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar 4th ed.) §§ 12.9-12.55

5 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 61, *Particular Liabilities and Immunities of Public Entities and Public Employees*, § 61.01 (Matthew Bender)

40 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Government Claims Act*, § 464.81 (Matthew Bender)

19A California Points and Authorities, Ch. 196, *Public Entities*, § 196.11 (Matthew Bender)

1123. Affirmative Defense—Design Immunity (Gov. Code, § 830.6)

[*Name of defendant***] claims that it is not responsible for harm to [***name of plaintiff***] caused by the plan or design of the [***insert type of property, e.g., highway***]. In order to prove this claim, [***name of defendant***] must prove both of the following:**

1. **That the plan or design was [prepared in conformity with standards previously] approved before [construction/improvement] by the [[***legislative body of the public entity, e.g., city council***]/[***other body or employee, e.g., city civil engineer***]] exercising [its/specifically delegated] discretionary authority to approve the plan or design; and**

2. **That the plan or design of the [***e.g., highway***] was a substantial factor in causing harm to [***name of plaintiff***].**

New December 2014; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

Give this instruction to present the affirmative defense of design immunity to a claim for liability caused by a dangerous condition on public property. (Gov. Code, § 830.6; see *Martinez v. County of Ventura* (2014) 225 Cal.App.4th 364, 369 [169 Cal.Rptr.3d 880] [design immunity is an affirmative defense that the public entity must plead and prove].)

A public entity claiming design immunity must establish three elements: (1) a causal relationship between the plan or design and the accident; (2) discretionary approval of the plan or design before construction; and (3) substantial evidence supporting the reasonableness of the plan or design. (*Cornette v. Dept. of Transportation* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 63, 66 [109 Cal.Rptr.2d 1, 26 P.3d 332].) The first two elements, causation and discretionary approval, are issues of fact for the jury to decide. (*Id.* at pp. 74–75; see also *Alvis v. County of Ventura* (2009) 178 Cal.App.4th 536, 550 [100 Cal.Rptr.3d 494] [elements may be resolved as issues of law only if facts are undisputed].) The third element, substantial evidence of reasonableness, must be tried by the court, not the jury. (*Cornette, supra,* 26 Cal.4th at pp. 66−67; see Gov. Code, § 830.6.)

In element 1, select "its" if it is the governing body that has exercised its discretionary authority. Select "specifically delegated" if it is some other body or employee.

The discretionary authority to approve the plan or design must be "vested," which means that the body or employee actually had the express authority to approve it. This authority cannot be implied from the circumstances. (*Castro v. City of Thousand Oaks* (2015) 239 Cal.App.4th 1451, 1457 [192 Cal.Rptr.3d 376],)

Sources and Authority

- Design Immunity. Government Code section 830.6.

- "The purpose of design immunity 'is to prevent a jury from second-guessing the decision of a public entity by reviewing the identical questions of risk that had previously been considered by the government officers who adopted or approved the plan or design. [Citation.]' ' "[T]o permit reexamination in tort litigation of particular discretionary decisions where reasonable men may differ as to how the discretion should be exercised would create too great a danger of impolitic interference with the freedom of decision-making by those public officials in whom the function of making such decisions has been vested." ' " (*Martinez, supra,* 225 Cal.App.4th at p. 369, internal citations omitted.)

- "Section 830.6 makes it quite clear that 'the trial or appellate court' is to determine whether 'there is any substantial evidence upon the basis of which (a) a reasonable public employee could have adopted the plan or design or the standards therefor or (b) a reasonable legislative body or other body or employee could have approved the plan or design or the standards therefor.' " (*Cornette, supra,* 26 Cal.4th at p. 66.)

- "To prove [the discretionary approval element of design immunity], the entity must show that the design was approved 'in advance' of the construction 'by the legislative body of the public entity or by some other body or employee exercising discretionary authority to give such approval or where such plan or design is prepared in conformity with standards previously so approved … .' 'Approval … is a vital precondition of the design immunity.' " (*Martinez, supra,* 225 Cal.App.4th at p. 369, internal citations omitted.)

- "In many cases, the evidence of discretionary authority to approve a design decision is clear, or even undisputed. For example, '[a] detailed plan, drawn up by a competent engineering firm, and approved by a city engineer in the exercise of his or her discretionary authority, is persuasive evidence of the element of prior approval. [Citation.]' When the discretionary approval issue is disputed, however, as it was here, we must determine whether the person who approved the construction had the discretionary authority to do so." (*Martinez, supra,* 225 Cal.App.4th at pp. 370−371, internal citations omitted.)

- "[T]he focus of discretional authority to approve a plan or design is fixed by law and will not be implied. '[T]he public entity claiming design immunity must prove that the person or entity who made the decision is vested with the authority to do so. Recognizing "implied" discretionary approval would vitiate this requirement and provide public entities with a blanket release from liability that finds no support in section 830.6.' " (*Castro, supra,* 239 Cal.App.4th at p. 1457~~[T]he public entity claiming design immunity must prove that the person or entity who made the decision is vested with the authority to do so. Recognizing 'implied' discretionary approval would vitiate this requirement and provide public entities with a blanket release from liability that finds no support in section 830.6." (*Martinez, supra,* 225 Cal.App.4th at p. 373~~.)

Secondary Sources

5 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, §§ 229, 280 et seq.

Haning et al., California Practice Guide: Personal Injury, Ch. 2(III)-D, Liability For "Dangerous Conditions" Of Public Property, ¶ 2:2855 et seq. (The Rutter Group)

5 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 61, *Particular Liabilities and Immunities of Public Entities and Public Employees*, § 61.03 (Matthew Bender)

40 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Government Claims Act*, § 464.85[2] (Matthew Bender)

19A California Points and Authorities, Ch. 196, *Public Entities*, § 196.12 (Matthew Bender)

1248. Affirmative Defense—Inherently Unsafe Consumer Product (Civ. Code, § 1714.45)

[*Name of defendant***] claims that it is not responsible for [***name of plaintiff***]'s claimed harm because [***specify product***] is an inherently unsafe consumer product. To succeed on this defense, [***name of defendant***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***product***] is a common consumer product intended for personal consumption; and**

2. **That [***product***] is inherently unsafe;**

3. **But [***product***] is no more dangerous than what an ordinary consumer of the product with knowledge common to the community would expect.**

New June 2016

Directions for Use

This instruction sets forth an immunity defense to product liability for a product that is clearly recognizable as inherently dangerous. (See Civ. Code, § 1714.45(a).) The statute requires that the product be "a common consumer product intended for personal consumption, such as sugar, castor oil, alcohol, and butter, as identified in comment i to Section 402A of the Restatement (Second) of Torts." (Civ. Code, § 1714.45(a)(2).) This reference is perhaps somewhat confusing because the Restatement comment makes it clear that sugar, castor oil, alcohol, and butter are not *unreasonably* dangerous. The implication from the statutory references is that though they are not unreasonably dangerous, they are inherently unsafe and thus within the protection provided to the manufacturer by the statute.

Sources and Authority

- Nonliability for Inherently Unsafe Consumer Product. Civil Code section 1714.45

- Comment i to Section 402A of the Restatement (Second) of Torts provides: "*Unreasonably dangerous*. The rule stated in this Section applies only where the defective condition of the product makes it unreasonably dangerous to the user or consumer. Many products cannot possibly be made entirely safe for all consumption, and any food or drug necessarily involves some risk of harm, if only from over-consumption. Ordinary sugar is a deadly poison to diabetics, and castor oil found use under Mussolini as an instrument of torture. That is not what is meant by "unreasonably dangerous" in this Section. The article sold must be dangerous to an extent beyond that which would be contemplated by the ordinary consumer who purchases it, with the ordinary knowledge common to the community as to its characteristics. Good whiskey is not unreasonably dangerous merely because it will make some people drunk, and is especially dangerous to alcoholics; but bad whiskey, containing a dangerous amount of fusel oil, is unreasonably dangerous. Good tobacco is not unreasonably dangerous merely because the effects of smoking may be harmful; but tobacco containing something like marijuana may be unreasonably

dangerous. Good butter is not unreasonably dangerous merely because, if such be the case, it deposits cholesterol in the arteries and leads to heart attacks; but bad butter, contaminated with poisonous fish oil, is unreasonably dangerous."

- "Additional limitations on the scope of the immunity may be deduced from the history and purpose of the Immunity Statute … . The statute's express premise … was 'that suppliers of certain products which are "inherently unsafe," but which the public wishes to have available despite awareness of their dangers, should not be responsible in tort for resulting harm to those who voluntarily consumed the products despite such knowledge.' … [The Immunity Statute [is] based on the principle that 'if a product is pure and unadulterated, its inherent or unavoidable danger, commonly known to the community which consumes it anyway, does not expose the seller to liability for resulting harm to a voluntary user.' " (*Naegele v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.* (2002) 28 Cal.4th 856, 862 [123 Cal.Rptr.2d 61, 50 P.3d 769], internal citations omitted.)

- "The law should not ignore interactive effects that might render a product more dangerous than is contemplated by the ordinary consumer who purchases it and possesses the ordinary knowledge common to the community as to the product's characteristics. Therefore, when a court addresses whether a multi-ingredient product is a common consumer product for purposes of Civil Code section 1714.45 and the ingredients have an interactive effect, the product and its inherent dangers must be considered as a whole so that the interactive effects of its ingredients are not overlooked or trivialized." (*Fiorini v. City Brewing Co., LLC* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 306, 325 [179 Cal.Rptr.3d 827].)

- "The foregoing inferences preclude us from finding, as a matter of law, that [product] was a common consumer product for purposes of Civil Code section 1714.45, subdivision (a) As a result, that factual question should be presented to the trier of fact." (*Fiorini, supra,* 231 Cal.App.4th at p. 326.)

Secondary Sources

1700. Defamation per se—Essential Factual Elements (Public Officer/Figure and Limited Public Figure)

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] harmed [him/her] by making [one or more of] the following statement(s): [***list all claimed per se defamatory statements***]. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove that all of the following are more likely true than not true:**

Liability

1. **That [***name of defendant***] made [one or more of] the statement(s) to [a person/persons] other than [***name of plaintiff***];**

2. **That [this person/these people] reasonably understood that the statement(s) [was/were] about [***name of plaintiff***];**

3. **[That [this person/these people] reasonably understood the statement(s) to mean that [***insert ground(s) for defamation per se, e.g., "[name of plaintiff] had committed a crime"***]]; and**

4. **That the statement(s) [was/were] false.**

In addition, [*name of plaintiff***] must prove by clear and convincing evidence that [***name of defendant***] knew the statement(s) [was/were] false or had serious doubts about the truth of the statement(s).**

Actual Damages

If [*name of plaintiff***] has proved all of the above, then [he/she] is entitled to recover [his/her] actual damages if [he/she] proves that [***name of defendant***]'s wrongful conduct was a substantial factor in causing any of the following:**

a. **Harm to [***name of plaintiff***]'s property, business, trade, profession, or occupation;**

b. **Expenses [***name of plaintiff***] had to pay as a result of the defamatory statements;**

c. **Harm to [***name of plaintiff***]'s reputation; or**

d. **Shame, mortification, or hurt feelings.**

Assumed Damages

Even if [*name of plaintiff***] has not proved any actual damages for harm to reputation or shame, mortification, or hurt feelings, the law nonetheless assumes that [he/she] has suffered this harm. Without presenting evidence of damage, [***name of plaintiff***] is entitled to receive compensation for this assumed harm in whatever sum you believe is reasonable. You must award at least a nominal sum, such as one dollar.**

Punitive Damages

[*Name of plaintiff***] may also recover damages to punish [***name of defendant***] if [he/she] proves by clear and convincing evidence that [***name of defendant***] acted with malice, oppression, or fraud.**

[*For specific provisions, see CACI Nos. 3940–3949.***]**

New September 2003; Revised April 2008, June 2016

Directions for Use

NOTE: The proposed addition to the Directions for Use, below, would be made to all Defamation Essential Factual Elements instructions (CACI Nos. 1700–1705).

Special verdict form CACI No. VF-1700, *Defamation per se (Public Officer/Figure and Limited Public Figure)*, should be used in this type of case.

Use the bracketed element 3 only if the statement is not defamatory on its face (i.e., if the judge has not determined that the statement is defamatory as a matter of law). For statutory grounds of defamation per se, see Civil Code sections 45 (libel) and 46 (slander). Note that certain specific grounds of libel per se have been defined by case law.

An additional element of a defamation claim is that the alleged defamatory statement is "unprivileged." (*Hui v. Sturbaum* (2014) 222 Cal.App.4th 1109, 1118 [166 Cal.Rptr.3d 569].) If this element presents an issue for the jury, an instruction on the "unprivileged" element should be given.

Under the common-interest privilege of Civil Code section 47(c), the defendant bears the initial burden of showing facts to bring the communication within the privilege. The plaintiff then must prove that the statement was made with malice. (*Lundquist v. Reusser* (1994) 7 Cal.4th 1193, 1203 [31 Cal.Rptr.2d 776, 875 P.2d 1279].) If the common-interest privilege is at issue, give CACI No. 1723, *Common Interest Privilege—Malice*. The elements of CACI No. 1723 constitute the "unprivileged" element of this basic claim. If some other privilege is at issue, an additional element or instruction targeting that privilege will be required.

Sources and Authority

- Defamation. Civil Code section 44.
- Libel Defined. Civil Code section 45.
- Libel per se. Civil Code section 45a.
- Slander Defined. Civil Code section 46.
- "Defamation is the intentional publication of a statement of fact that is false, unprivileged, and has a

natural tendency to injure or that causes special damage." (*Grenier v. Taylor* (2015) 234 Cal.App.4th 471, 486 [183 Cal.Rptr.3d 867].)

- "The elements of a defamation claim are (1) a publication that is (2) false, (3) defamatory, (4) unprivileged, and (5) has a natural tendency to injure or causes special damage." (*Wong v. Jing* (2010) 189 Cal.App.4th 1354, 1369 [117 Cal.Rptr.3d 747].)

- "[S]tatements cannot form the basis of a defamation action if they cannot be reasonably interpreted as stating actual facts about an individual. Thus, rhetorical hyperbole, vigorous epithets, lusty and imaginative expressions of contempt and language used in a loose, figurative sense will not support a defamation action." (*Grenier, supra,* 234 Cal.App.4th at p. 486.)

- " ' "If no reasonable reader would perceive in a false and unprivileged publication a meaning which tended to injure the subject's reputation in any of the enumerated respects, then there is no libel at all. If such a reader would perceive a defamatory meaning without extrinsic aid beyond his or her own intelligence and common sense, then … there is a libel per se. But if the reader would be able to recognize a defamatory meaning only by virtue of his or her knowledge of specific facts and circumstances, extrinsic to the publication, which are not matters of common knowledge rationally attributable to all reasonable persons, then … the libel cannot be libel per se but will be libel per quod," requiring pleading and proof of special damages.' " (*Barker v. Fox & Associates* (2015) 240 Cal.App.4th 333, 351−352 [192 Cal.Rptr.3d 511].)

- ~~California does not follow the majority rule, which is that all libel is actionable per se. If the court determines that the statement is reasonably susceptible to a defamatory interpretation, it is for the jury to determine if a defamatory meaning was in fact conveyed to a listener or reader. (*Kahn v. Bower* (1991) 232 Cal.App.3d 1599, 1608 [284 Cal.Rptr. 244].)~~

- ~~A plaintiff is not required to allege special damages if the statement is libelous per se (either on its face or by jury finding). (*Selleck v. Globe Int'l, Inc.* (1985) 166 Cal.App.3d 1123, 1130 [212 Cal.Rptr. 838].)~~

- "A slander that falls within the first four subdivisions of Civil Code section 46 is slander per se and requires no proof of actual damages. A slander that does not fit into those four subdivisions is slander per quod, and special damages are required for there to be any recovery for that slander." (*The Nethercutt Collection v. Regalia* (2009) 172 Cal.App.4th 361, 367 [90 Cal.Rptr.3d 882], internal citations omitted.)

- "With respect to slander per se, the trial court decides if the alleged statement falls within Civil Code section 46, subdivisions 1 through 4. It is then for the trier of fact to determine if the statement is defamatory. This allocation of responsibility may appear, at first glance, to result in an overlap of responsibilities because a trial court determination that the statement falls within those categories would seemingly suggest that the statement, if false, is necessarily defamatory. But a finder of fact might rely upon extraneous evidence to conclude that, under the circumstances, the statement was not defamatory." (*The Nethercutt Collection, supra,* 172 Cal.App.4th at pp. 368–369.)

- "[T]he jury was instructed that if it found that defendant published matter that was defamatory on its

face and it found by clear and convincing evidence that defendant knew the statement was false or published it in reckless disregard of whether it was false, then the jury 'also may award plaintiff presumed general damages.' Presumed damages 'are those damages that necessarily result from the publication of defamatory matter and are presumed to exist. They include reasonable compensation for loss of reputation, shame, mortification, and hurt feeling. No definite standard or method of calculation is prescribed by law by which to fix reasonable compensation for presumed damages, and no evidence of actual harm is required. Nor is the opinion of any witness required as to the amount of such reasonable compensation. In making an award for presumed damages, you shall exercise your authority with calm and reasonable judgment and the damages you fix shall be just and reasonable in the light of the evidence. You may in the exercise of your discretion award nominal damages only, namely an insignificant sum such as one dollar.' [¶] … [¶] … [T]he instant instruction, which limits damages to 'those damages that necessarily result from the publication of defamatory matter,' constitutes substantial compliance with [Civil Code] section 3283. Thus, the instant instructions, 'if obeyed, did not allow the jurors to "enter the realm of speculation" regarding future suffering.' " (*Sommer v. Gabor* (1995) 40 Cal.App.4th 1455, 1472–1473 [48 Cal.Rptr.2d 235], internal citations omitted.)

- "In defamation actions generally, factual truth is a defense which it is the defendant's burden to prove. In a defamation action against a newspaper by a private person suing over statements of public concern, however, the First Amendment places the burden of proving falsity on the plaintiff. As a matter of constitutional law, therefore, media statements on matters of public interest, including statements of opinion which reasonably imply a knowledge of facts, 'must be provable as false before there can be liability under state defamation law.' " (*Eisenberg v. Alameda Newspapers* (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 1359, 1382 [88 Cal.Rptr.2d 802], internal citations omitted.)

- In matters involving public concern, the First Amendment protection applies to nonmedia defendants, putting the burden of proving falsity of the statement on the plaintiff. (*Nizam-Aldine v. City of Oakland* (1996) 47 Cal.App.4th 364, 375 [54 Cal.Rptr.2d 781].)

- "Publication means communication to some third person who understands the defamatory meaning of the statement and its application to the person to whom reference is made. Publication need not be to the 'public' at large; communication to a single individual is sufficient." (*Smith, supra,* 72 Cal.App.4th at p. 645, internal citations omitted.)

- "[W]hen a party repeats a slanderous charge, he is equally guilty of defamation, even though he states the source of the charge and indicates that he is merely repeating a rumor." (*Jackson v. Paramount Pictures Corp.* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th 10, 26 [80 Cal.Rptr.2d 1], internal citation omitted.)

- "At common law, one who republishes a defamatory statement is deemed thereby to have adopted it and so may be held liable, together with the person who originated the statement, for resulting injury to the reputation of the defamation victim. California has adopted the common law in this regard, although by statute the republication of defamatory statements is privileged in certain defined situations." (*Khawar v. Globe Internat.* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 254, 268 [79 Cal.Rptr.2d 178, 965 P.2d 696], internal citations omitted.)

- The general rule is that "a plaintiff cannot manufacture a defamation cause of action by publishing the

statements to third persons; the publication must be done by the defendant." There is an exception to this rule. [When it is foreseeable that the plaintiff] " 'will be under a strong compulsion to disclose the contents of the defamatory statement to a third person after he has read it or been informed of its contents.' " (*Live Oak Publishing Co. v. Cohagan* (1991) 234 Cal.App.3d 1277, 1284 [286 Cal.Rptr. 198], internal citations omitted.)

- Whether a plaintiff in a defamation action is a public figure is a question of law for the trial court. (*Reader's Digest Assn. v. Superior Court* (1984) 37 Cal.3d 244, 252 [208 Cal.Rptr. 137, 690 P.2d 610].)

- "To qualify as a limited purpose public figure, a plaintiff 'must have undertaken some voluntary [affirmative] act[ion] through which he seeks to influence the resolution of the public issues involved.' " (*Rudnick v. McMillan* (1994) 25 Cal.App.4th 1183, 1190 [31 Cal.Rptr.2d 193]; see also *Mosesian v. McClatchy Newspapers* (1991) 233 Cal.App.3d 1685, 1689 [285 Cal.Rptr. 430].)

- "Characterizing a plaintiff as a limited purpose public figure requires the presence of certain elements. First, there must be a public controversy about a topic that concerns a substantial number of people. In other words, the issue was publicly debated. Second, the plaintiff must have voluntarily acted to influence resolution of the issue of public interest. To satisfy this element, the plaintiff need only attempt to thrust himself or herself into the public eye. Once the plaintiff places himself or herself in the spotlight on a topic of public interest, his or her private words and acts relating to that topic become fair game. However, the alleged defamation must be germane to the plaintiff's participation in the public controversy." (*Grenier, supra,* 234 Cal.App.4th at p. 484, internal citations omitted.)

- "The First Amendment limits California's libel law in various respects. When, as here, the plaintiff is a public figure, he cannot recover unless he proves by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant published the defamatory statement with actual malice, i.e., with 'knowledge that it was false or with reckless disregard of whether it was false or not.' Mere negligence does not suffice. Rather, the plaintiff must demonstrate that the author 'in fact entertained serious doubts as to the truth of his publication,' or acted with a 'high degree of awareness of ... probable falsity.' " (*Masson v. New Yorker Magazine* (1991) 501 U.S. 496, 510 [111 S.Ct. 2419, 115 L.Ed.2d 447], internal citations omitted; see *St. Amant v. Thompson* (1968) 390 U.S. 727, 731 [88 S.Ct. 1323, 20 L.Ed.2d 262]; *New York Times v. Sullivan* (1964) 376 U.S. 254, 279–280 [84 S.Ct. 710, 11 L.Ed.2d 686].)

- The *New York Times v. Sullivan* standard applies to private individuals with respect to presumed or punitive damages if the statement involves a matter of public concern. (*Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.* (1974) 418 U.S. 323, 349 [94 S.Ct. 2997, 41 L.Ed.2d 789].)

- "California ... permits defamation liability so long as it is consistent with the requirements of the United States Constitution." (*Melaleuca, Inc. v. Clark* (1998) 66 Cal.App.4th 1344, 1359 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 627], citing *Brown v. Kelly Broadcasting Co.* (1989) 48 Cal.3d 711, 740–742 [257 Cal.Rptr. 708, 771 P.2d 406].)

- "Actual malice under the *New York Times* standard should not be confused with the concept of malice as an evil intent or a motive arising from spite or ill will. ... In place of the term actual malice, it is

better practice that jury instructions refer to publication of a statement with knowledge of falsity or reckless disregard as to truth or falsity." (*Masson, supra,* 501 U.S. at pp. 510–511, internal citations omitted.)

- Actual malice "does not require that the reporter hold a devout belief in the truth of the story being reported, only that he or she refrain from either reporting a story he or she knows to be false or acting in reckless disregard of the truth." (*Jackson, supra,* 68 Cal.App.4th at p. 35.)

- "The law is clear [that] the recklessness or doubt which gives rise to actual or constitutional malice is subjective recklessness or doubt." (*Melaleuca, Inc., supra,* 66 Cal.App.4th at p. 1365.)

- To show reckless disregard, "[t]here must be sufficient evidence to permit the conclusion that the defendant in fact entertained serious doubts as to the truth of his publication. Publishing with such doubts shows reckless disregard for truth or falsity and demonstrates actual malice." (*St. Amant, supra,* 390 U.S. at p. 731.)

- " 'A defamation plaintiff may rely on inferences drawn from circumstantial evidence to show actual malice. [Citation.] "A failure to investigate [fn. omitted] [citation], anger and hostility toward the plaintiff [citation], reliance upon sources known to be unreliable [citations], or known to be biased against the plaintiff [citations]—such factors may, in an appropriate case, indicate that the publisher himself had serious doubts regarding the truth of his publication." ' " (*Sanders v. Walsh* (2013) 219 Cal.App.4th 855, 873 [162 Cal.Rptr.3d 188].)

- " ' "[Evidence] of negligence, of motive and of intent may be adduced for the purpose of establishing, by cumulation and by appropriate inferences, the fact of a defendant's recklessness or of his knowledge of falsity." [Citations.] A failure to investigate [citation], anger and hostility toward the plaintiff [citation], reliance upon sources known to be unreliable [citations], or known to be biased against the plaintiff [citations]—such factors may, in an appropriate case, indicate that the publisher himself had serious doubts regarding the truth of his publication. [¶] We emphasize that such evidence is relevant only to the extent that it reflects on the subjective attitude of the publisher. [Citations.] The failure to conduct a thorough and objective investigation, standing alone, does not prove actual malice, nor even necessarily raise a triable issue of fact on that controversy. [Citations.] Similarly, mere proof of ill will on the part of the publisher may likewise be insufficient. [Citation.]' " (*Young v. CBS Broadcasting, Inc.* (2012) 212 Cal.App.4th 551, 563 [151 Cal.Rptr.3d 237], quoting *Reader's Digest Assn., supra,* 37 Cal.3d at pp. 257–258, footnote omitted.)

- "An entity other than a natural person may be libeled." (*Live Oak Publishing Co., supra,* 234 Cal.App.3d at p. 1283.)

Secondary Sources

5 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, §§ 529–555, 601–612

Chin, et al., California Practice Guide: Employment Litigation, Ch. 5-D, *Employment Torts And Related Claims—Defamation,* ¶ 5:372 (The Rutter Group)

4 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 45, *Defamation*, §§ 45.04, 45.13 (Matthew Bender)

30 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 340, *Libel and Slander*, § 340.10 et seq. (Matthew Bender)

14 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 142, *Libel and Slander (Defamation)*, §§ 142.24–142.27 (Matthew Bender)

1 California Civil Practice: Torts §§ 21:1–21:2, 21:22–21:25, 21:44–21:52 (Thomson Reuters)

1722. Retraction: News Publication~~paper~~ or Broadcast (Civ. Code, § 48a)

Because [*name of defendant***] is a [news ~~paper~~publication/broadcaster], [***name of plaintiff***] may recover only the following:**

(a) Damages to property, business, trade, profession, or occupation; and

(b) Damages for money spent as a result of the defamation.

However, this limitation does not apply if [*name of plaintiff***] proves both of the following:**

1. That [*name of plaintiff***] demanded a correction of the statement within 20 days of discovering the statement; and**

2. That [*name of defendant***] did not publish an adequate correction;**

[or]

That [*name of defendant***]'s correction was not substantially as conspicuous as the original [publication/broadcast];**

[or]

That [*name of defendant***]'s correction was not [published/broadcast] within three weeks of [***name of plaintiff***]'s demand.**

New September 2003; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

The judge should decide whether the demand for a retraction was served in compliance with the statute. (*O'Hara v. Storer Communications, Inc.* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 1101, 1110 [282 Cal.Rptr. 712].)

Sources and Authority

- Demand for Correction. Civil Code section 48a.
- "Under California law, a newspaper gains immunity from liability for all but 'special damages' when it prints a retraction satisfying the requirements of section 48a." (*Pierce v. San Jose Mercury News* (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 1626, 1631 [263 Cal.Rptr. 410]; see also *Twin Coast Newspapers, Inc. v. Superior Court* (1989) 208 Cal.App.3d 656, 660-661 [256 Cal.Rptr. 310].)
- "An equivocal or incomplete retraction obviously serves no purpose even if it is published in 'substantially as conspicuous a manner ... as were the statements claimed to be libelous.' " (*Weller v.*

American Broadcasting Companies, Inc. (1991) 232 Cal.App.3d 991, 1011 [283 Cal.Rptr. 644].)

Secondary Sources

5 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, §§ 629–639

4 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 45, *Defamation*, § 45.24 (Matthew Bender)

30 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 340, *Libel and Slander*, § 340.53 (Matthew Bender)

14 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 142, *Libel and Slander (Defamation)*, § 142.37 (Matthew Bender)

1 California Civil Practice: Torts §§ 21:55–21:57 (Thomson Reuters)

2020. Public Nuisance—Essential Factual Elements

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [he/she] suffered harm because [***name of defendant***] created a nuisance. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***], by acting or failing to act, created a condition that [***insert one or more of the following:***]**

   _____**[was harmful to health;] [or]**

   _____**[was indecent or offensive to the senses;] [or]**

   _____**[was an obstruction to the free use of property, so as to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property;] [or]**

   _____**[unlawfully obstructed the free passage or use, in the customary manner, of any navigable lake, or river, bay, stream, canal, or basin, or any public park, square, street, or highway;] [or]**

   _____ **[was [a/an] [fire hazard/***specify other potentially dangerous condition***] to [***name of plaintiff***]'s property;**

2. **That the condition affected a substantial number of people at the same time;**

3. **That an ordinary person would be reasonably annoyed or disturbed by the condition;**

4. **That the seriousness of the harm outweighs the social utility of [***name of defendant***]'s conduct;**

5. **That [***name of plaintiff***] did not consent to [***name of defendant***]'s conduct;**

6. **That [***name of plaintiff***] suffered harm that was different from the type of harm suffered by the general public; and**

7. **That [***name of defendant***]'s conduct was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

New September 2003; Revised December 2007, June 2016

Directions for Use

Private nuisance concerns injury to a property interest. Public nuisance is not dependent on an interference with rights of land: "[A] private nuisance is a civil wrong based on disturbance of rights in land while a public nuisance is not dependent upon a disturbance of rights in land but upon an

interference with the rights of the community at large." (*Venuto v. Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.* (1971) 22 Cal.App.3d 116, 124 [99 Cal.Rptr. 350], internal citation omitted.)

Sources and Authority

- "Nuisance" Defined. Civil Code section 3479.
- Public Nuisance. Civil Code section 3480.
- Action by Private Person for Public Nuisance. Civil Code section 3493.
- Act Done Under Express Authority of Statute. Civil Code section 3482.
- Property Used for Dogfighting and Cockfighting. Civil Code section 3482.8.
- "[T]he exculpatory effect of Civil Code section 3482 has been circumscribed by decisions of this court. ...' "A statutory sanction cannot be pleaded in justification of acts which by the general rules of law constitute a nuisance, unless the acts complained of are authorized by the express terms of the statute under which the justification is made, or by the plainest and most necessary implication from the powers expressly conferred, so that it can be fairly stated that the Legislature contemplated the doing of the very act which occasions the injury." ' " (*Varjabedian v. City of Madera* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 285, 291 [142 Cal.Rptr. 429, 572 P.2d 43], internal citation omitted.)
- "Where the nuisance alleged is not also a private nuisance as to a private individual he does not have a cause of action on account of a public nuisance unless he alleges facts showing special injury to himself in person or property of a character different in kind from that suffered by the general public." (*Venuto, supra,* 22 Cal.App.3d at p. 124, internal citations omitted; but see *Birke v. Oakwood Worldwide* (2009) 169 Cal.App.4th 1540, 1550 [87 Cal.Rptr.3d 602] ["to the extent *Venuto* … can be read as precluding an action to abate a public nuisance by a private individual who has suffered personal injuries as a result of the challenged condition, we believe it is an incorrect statement of the law"].)
- "Unlike the private nuisance-tied to and designed to vindicate individual ownership interests in land-the 'common' or public nuisance emerged from distinctly different historical origins. The public nuisance doctrine is aimed at the protection and redress of community interests and, at least in theory, embodies a kind of collective ideal of civil life which the courts have vindicated by equitable remedies since the beginning of the 16th century." (*People ex rel. Gallo v. Acuna* (1997) 14 Cal.4th 1090, 1103 [60 Cal.Rptr.2d 277, 929 P.2d 596].)
- "[W]hen the nuisance is a private as well as a public one, there is no requirement the plaintiff suffer damage different in kind from that suffered by the general public. That is, the plaintiff ' "does not lose his rights as a landowner merely because others suffer damage of the same kind, or even of the same degree … ." ' " (*Birke, supra,* 169 Cal.App.4th at p. 1551, internal citations omitted.)
- "Of course, not every interference with collective social interests constitutes a public nuisance. To qualify ... the interference must be both substantial and unreasonable." (*People ex rel. Gallo, supra,* 14 Cal.4th at p. 1105.)

- "The fact that the defendants' alleged misconduct consists of omission rather than affirmative actions does not preclude nuisance liability." (*Birke, supra,* 169 Cal.App.4th at p. 1552 [citing this instruction], internal citation omitted.)

- "A nuisance may be either a negligent or an intentional tort." (*Stoiber v. Honeychuck* (1980) 101 Cal.App.3d 903, 920 [162 Cal.Rptr. 194], internal citation omitted.)

- "Nuisance liability is not necessarily based on negligence, thus, 'one may be liable for a nuisance even in the absence of negligence. [Citations.]' However, ' "where liability for the nuisance is predicated on the omission of the owner of the premises to abate it, rather than on his having created it, then negligence is said to be involved. …" [Citations.]' " (*City of Pasadena v. Superior Court* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1228, 1236 [176 Cal.Rptr.3d 422], internal citations omitted.)

- "An essential element of a cause of action for nuisance is damage or injury." (*Helix Land Co., Inc. v. City of San Diego* (1978) 82 Cal.App.3d 932, 950 [147 Cal.Rptr. 683].)

- "[M]ere apprehension of injury from a dangerous condition may constitute a nuisance where it interferes with the comfortable enjoyment of property… . (*McIvor v. Mercer-Fraser Co.* (1946) 76 Cal.App.2d 247, 254 [172 P.2d 758].)

- "A fire hazard, at least when coupled with other conditions, can be found to be a public nuisance and abated." (*People v. Oliver* (1948) 86 Cal.App.2d 885, 889 [185 P.2d 926].)

- "By analogy to the rules governing tort liability, courts apply the same elements to determine liability for a public nuisance." (*People ex rel. Gallo, supra,* 14 Cal.4th at p. 1105, fn. 3, internal citation omitted.)

- "The elements 'of a cause of action for public nuisance include the existence of a duty and causation.' Public nuisance liability 'does not hinge on whether the defendant owns, possesses or controls the property, nor on whether he is in a position to abate the nuisance; the critical question is whether the defendant created or assisted in the creation of the nuisance.' " (*Melton v. Boustred* (2010) 183 Cal.App.4th 521, 542 [107 Cal.Rptr.3d 481], internal citations omitted.)

- " 'Where negligence and nuisance causes of action rely on the same facts about lack of due care, the nuisance claim is a negligence claim.' The nuisance claim 'stands or falls with the determination of the negligence cause of action' in such cases." (*Melton, supra,* 183 Cal.App.4th at p. 542, internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

13 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Equity, § 133

Greenwald & Asimow, California Practice Guide: Real Property Transactions, Ch. 5-D, *Common Law Environmental Hazards Liability*, ¶¶ 5:140-5:179 (The Rutter Group)

California Real Property Remedies and Damages (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) Ch. 11, Remedies for Nuisance and Trespass, § 11.7

2 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 17, *Nuisance and Trespass*, §§ 17.01–17.04, 17.06 (Matthew Bender)

34 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 391, *Nuisance*, § 391.12 (Matthew Bender)

16 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 167, *Nuisance*, § 167.20 et seq. (Matthew Bender)

1 California Civil Practice: Torts §§ 17:1–17:3 (Thomson Reuters)

2021. Private Nuisance—Essential Factual Elements

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] interfered with [***name of plaintiff***]'s use and enjoyment of [his/her] land. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***] [owned/leased/occupied/controlled] the property;**

2. **That [***name of defendant***], by acting or failing to act, created a condition or permitted a condition to exist that [***insert one or more of the following:***]**

   _____[was harmful to health;] [or]

   _____[was indecent or offensive to the senses;] [or]

   _____[was an obstruction to the free use of property, so as to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property;] [or]

   _____[unlawfully obstructed the free passage or use, in the customary manner, of any navigable lake, or river, bay, stream, canal, or basin, or any public park, square, street, or highway;]

   _____[was [a/an] [fire hazard/*specify other potentially dangerous condition***] to [***name of plaintiff***]'s property;]**

3. **That this condition interfered with [***name of plaintiff***]'s use or enjoyment of [his/her] land;**

4. **That [***name of plaintiff***] did not consent to [***name of defendant***]'s conduct;**

5. **That an ordinary person would be reasonably annoyed or disturbed by** [***name of defendant***]**'s conduct;**

6. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed;**

7. **That [***name of defendant***]'s conduct was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm; and**

8. **That the seriousness of the harm outweighs the public benefit of [***name of defendant***]'s conduct.**

New September 2003; Revised February 2007, December 2011, December 2015, June 2016

Directions for Use

Element 8 must be supplemented with CACI No. 2022, *Private Nuisance—Balancing-Test Factors—Seriousness of Harm and Public Benefit*. (See *Wilson v. Southern California Edison Co.* (2015) 234 Cal.App. 4th 123, 160−165 [184 Cal.Rptr.3d 26].) For instruction on control of property, see CACI No. 1002, *Extent of Control Over Premises Area*, in the Premises Liability series.

Sources and Authority

- "Nuisance" Defined. Civil Code section 3479.
- Acts Done Under Express Authority of Statute. Civil Code section 3482.
- "[T]he exculpatory effect of Civil Code section 3482 has been circumscribed by decisions of this court. ... ' "A statutory sanction cannot be pleaded in justification of acts which by the general rules of law constitute a nuisance, unless the acts complained of are authorized by the express terms of the statute under which the justification is made, or by the plainest and most necessary implication from the powers expressly conferred, so that it can be fairly stated that the Legislature contemplated the doing of the very act which occasions the injury.' " " (*Varjabedian v. City of Madera* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 285, 291 [142 Cal.Rptr. 429, 572 P.2d 43], internal citation omitted.)
- "In distinction to trespass, liability for nuisance does not require proof of damage to the plaintiff's property; proof of interference with the plaintiff's use and enjoyment of that property is sufficient." (*San Diego Gas & Electric Co. v. Superior Court* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 893, 937 [55 Cal.Rptr.2d 724, 920 P.2d 669].)
- "[T]he essence of a private nuisance is its interference with the use and enjoyment of land. The activity in issue must 'disturb or prevent the comfortable enjoyment of property,' such as smoke from an asphalt mixing plant, noise and odors from the operation of a refreshment stand, or the noise and vibration of machinery." (*Oliver v. AT&T Wireless Services* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 521, 534 [90 Cal.Rptr.2d 491], internal citations omitted.)
- "Unlike public nuisance, which is an interference with the rights of the community at large, private nuisance is a civil wrong based on disturbance of rights in land. A nuisance may be both public and private, but to proceed on a private nuisance theory the plaintiff must prove an injury specifically referable to the use and enjoyment of his or her land. The injury, however, need not be different in kind from that suffered by the general public." (*Koll-Irvine Center Property Owners Assn. v. County of Orange* (1994) 24 Cal.App.4th 1036, 1041 [29 Cal.Rptr.2d 664], internal citation omitted.)
- "Examples of interferences with the use and enjoyment of land actionable under a private nuisance theory are legion. 'So long as the interference is substantial and unreasonable, and such as would be offensive or inconvenient to the normal person, virtually any disturbance of the enjoyment of the property may amount to a nuisance.' " (*Koll-Irvine Center Property Owners Assn., supra,* 24 Cal.App.4th at p. 1041, internal citation omitted.)

- "The first additional requirement for recovery of damages on a nuisance theory is proof that the invasion of the plaintiff's interest in the use and enjoyment of the land was substantial, i.e., that it caused the plaintiff to suffer 'substantial actual damage.' The Restatement recognizes the same requirement as the need for proof of 'significant harm,' which it variously defines as 'harm of importance' and a 'real and appreciable invasion of the plaintiff's interests' and an invasion that is 'definitely offensive, seriously annoying or intolerable.' The degree of harm is to be judged by an objective standard, i.e., what effect would the invasion have on persons of normal health and sensibilities living in the same community? 'If normal persons in that locality would not be substantially annoyed or disturbed by the situation, then the invasion is not a significant one, even though the idiosyncrasies of the particular plaintiff may make it unendurable to him.' This is, of course, a question of fact that turns on the circumstances of each case." (*San Diego Gas & Electric Co., supra,* 13 Cal.4th at p. 938, internal citations omitted.)

- "The second additional requirement for nuisance is superficially similar but analytically distinct: 'The interference with the protected interest must not only be substantial, but it must also be unreasonable', i.e., it must be 'of such a nature, duration or amount as to constitute unreasonable interference with the use and enjoyment of the land.' The primary test for determining whether the invasion is unreasonable is whether the gravity of the harm outweighs the social utility of the defendant's conduct, taking a number of factors into account. Again the standard is objective: the question is not whether the particular plaintiff found the invasion unreasonable, but 'whether reasonable persons generally, looking at the whole situation impartially and objectively, would consider it unreasonable.' And again this is a question of fact: 'Fundamentally, the unreasonableness of intentional invasions is a problem of relative values to be determined by the trier of fact in each case in the light of all the circumstances of that case.' "(*San Diego Gas & Electric Co., supra,* 13 Cal.4th at pp. 938-939, internal citations omitted.)

- "Appellant first argues that the judgment is erroneous because there is no showing that any act or conduct of his caused the damage. It is true that there is neither showing nor finding of any negligent or wrongful act or omission of defendant proximately causing the falling of the trees. But no such showing is required. If the trees remained upright, with some of their branches extending over or upon plaintiff's land, they clearly would constitute a nuisance, which defendant could be required to abate." (*Mattos v. Mattos* (1958) 162 Cal.App.2d 41, 42 [328 P.2d 269].)

- "The fact that the defendants' alleged misconduct consists of omission rather than affirmative actions does not preclude nuisance liability." (*Birke v. Oakwood Worldwide* (2009) 169 Cal.App.4th 1540, 1552 [87 Cal.Rptr.3d 602], internal citations omitted.)

- "A nuisance may be either a negligent or an intentional tort." (*Stoiber v. Honeychuck* (1980) 101 Cal.App.3d 903, 920 [162 Cal.Rptr. 194], internal citation omitted.)

- "Nuisance liability is not necessarily based on negligence, thus, 'one may be liable for a nuisance even in the absence of negligence. [Citations.]' However, ' " 'where liability for the

nuisance is predicated on the omission of the owner of the premises to abate it, rather than on his having created it, then negligence is said to be involved. …" [Citations.]' " (*City of Pasadena v. Superior Court* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1228, 1236 [176 Cal.Rptr.3d 422, internal citations omitted.)

- "We acknowledge that to recover on a nuisance claim the harm the plaintiff suffers need not be a physical injury. Thus, the absence of evidence in this case to establish that [plaintiff] 's physical injuries were caused by the stray voltage would not preclude recovery on her nuisance claim." (*Wilson, supra,* 234 Cal.App.4th at p. 159, internal citations omitted.)

- "[M]ere apprehension of injury from a dangerous condition may constitute a nuisance where it interferes with the comfortable enjoyment of property… . (*McIvor v. Mercer-Fraser Co.* (1946) 76 Cal.App.2d 247, 254 [172 P.2d 758].)

- "A fire hazard, at least when coupled with other conditions, can be found to be a public nuisance and abated." (*People v. Oliver* (1948) 86 Cal.App.2d 885, 889 [185 P.2d 926].)

- Restatement Second of Torts, section 822 provides:
  One is subject to liability for a private nuisance if, but only if, his conduct is a legal cause of an invasion of another's interest in the private use and enjoyment of land, and the invasion is either
  (a) intentional and unreasonable, or
  (b) unintentional and otherwise actionable under the rules controlling liability for negligent or reckless conduct, or for abnormally dangerous conditions or activities.

- Restatement Second of Torts, section 826 provides:
  An intentional invasion of another's interest in the use and enjoyment of land is unreasonable if

  (a) the gravity of the harm outweighs the utility of the actor's conduct, or
  (b) the harm caused by the conduct is serious and the financial burden of compensating for this and similar harm to others would not make the continuation of the conduct not feasible.

Secondary Sources

13 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Equity, § 153

2 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 17, *Nuisance and Trespass*, §§ 17.01–17.05 (Matthew Bender)

34 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 391, *Nuisance*, § 391.13 (Matthew Bender)

16 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 167, *Nuisance*, § 167.20 (Matthew Bender)

California Civil Practice: Torts §§ 17:1, 17:2, 17:4 (Thomson Reuters)

2210. Affirmative Defense—Privilege to Protect Own Financial Interest

[*Name of defendant***] claims that there was no intentional interference with contractual relations because [he/she/it] acted only to protect [his/her/its] legitimate financial interests. To succeed, [***name of defendant***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] had a [legitimate] financial interest in the contractual relations because [***specify financial interest***];**

2. **That [***name of defendant***]acted only to protect [his/her/its] own financial interest;**

3. **That [***name of defendant***] acted reasonably and in good faith to protect it; and**

4. **That [***name of defendant***] used appropriate means to protect it.**

New June 2016

Directions for Use

Give this instruction as an affirmative defense to a claim for intentional interference with contractual relations. (See CACI No. 2201.) The defense presents a justification based on the defendant's right to protect its own financial interest.

In element 1, the jury should be told the specific financial interest that the defendant was acting to protect. Include "legitimate" if the jury will be asked to determine whether that financial interest was legitimate, as opposed perhaps to pretextual or fraudulent.

Sources and Authority

- "In harmony with the general guidelines of the test for justification is the narrow protection afforded to a party where (1) he has a legally protected interest, (2) in good faith threatens to protect it, and (3) the threat is to protect it by appropriate means. Prosser adds: "Where the defendant acts to further his own advantage, other distinctions have been made. If he has a present, existing economic interest to protect, such as the ownership or condition of property, or a prior contract of his own, or a financial interest in the affairs of the person persuaded, he is privileged to prevent performance of the contract of another which threatens it; and for obvious reasons of policy he is likewise privileged to assert an honest claim, or bring or threaten a suit in good faith." (*Richardson v. La Rancherita* (1979) 98 Cal.App.3d 73, 81 [159 Cal.Rptr. 285].)

- "Justification for the interference is an affirmative defense and not an element of plaintiff's cause of action." (*Richardson, supra,* 98 Cal.App.3d at p. 80.)

- "Something other than sincerity and an honest conviction by a party in his position is required

before justification for his conduct on the grounds of 'good faith' can be established. There must be an objective basis for the belief which requires more than reliance on counsel." (*Richardson, supra,* 98 Cal.App.3d at pp. 82−83.)

- "A thoroughly bad motive, that is, a purpose solely to harm the plaintiff, of course, is sufficient to exclude any apparent privilege which the interests of the parties might otherwise create, just as such a motive will defeat the immunity of any other conditional privilege. If the defendant does not act in a bona fide attempt to protect his own interest or the interest of others involved in the situation, he forfeits the immunity of the privilege. . . . *Conduct is actionable, when it is indulged solely to harm another, since the legitimate interest of the defendant is practically eliminated from consideration*. The defendant's interest, although of such a character as to justify an invasion of another's similar interest, is not to be taken into account when the defendant acts, not for the purpose of protecting that interest, but *solely* to damage the plaintiff." (*Bridges v. Cal-Pacific Leasing Co.* (1971) 16 Cal.App.3d 118, 132 [93 Cal.Rptr. 796], original italics.)

Secondary Sources

2332. Bad Faith (First Party)—Failure to Properly Investigate Claim–Essential Factual Elements

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] breached the obligation of good faith and fair dealing by failing to conduct a proper investigation of [his/her/its] claim. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***] suffered a loss covered under an insurance policy issued by [***name of defendant***];**

2. **That [***name of plaintiff***] filed a claim to be compensated by [***name of defendant***] for the loss;**

3. **That [***name of defendant***], unreasonably failed to conduct a full, fair, and thorough investigation of all of the bases of [***name of plaintiff***]'s claim.**

4. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

5. **That [***name of defendant***]'s failure to properly investigate the claim was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

To act or fail to act "unreasonably" means that the insurer had no proper cause for its conduct.[*Name of defendant*] acted unreasonably, that is, without proper cause, if it failed to conduct a full, fair, and thorough investigation of all of the bases of the claim. When investigating [*name of plaintiff***]'s claim, [***name of defendant***] had a duty to diligently search for and consider evidence that supported coverage of the claimed loss.**

New September 2003; Revised December 2005, December 2007, April 2008, June 2016

Directions for Use

This instruction sets forth a claim for breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing based on the insurer's failure or refusal to conduct a proper investigation of the plaintiff's claim.must be used with CACI No. 2331, *Breach of the Implied Obligation of Good Faith and Fair Dealing—Failure or Delay in Payment (First Party)—Essential Factual Elements,* if it is alleged . The claim alleges that the insurer acted unreasonably, that is or without proper cause, by failing to properly investigate the claim. (See *Rappaport-Scott v. Interinsurance Exch. of the Auto. Club* (2007) 146 Cal.App.4th 831, 837 [53 Cal.Rptr.3d 245].)

The instructions in this series assume that the plaintiff is the insured and the defendant is the insurer. The party designations may be changed if appropriate to the facts of the case.

For instructions regarding general breach of contract issues, refer to the Contracts series (CACI No. 300 et seq.).

Sources and Authority

- "[A]n insurer may breach the covenant of good faith and fair dealing when it fails to properly investigate its insured's claim." (*Egan v. Mutual of Omaha Insurance Co.* (1979) 24 Cal.3d 809, 817 [169 Cal.Rptr. 691, 620 P.2d 141].)

- "To fulfill its implied obligation, an insurer must give at least as much consideration to the interests of the insured as it gives to its own interests. When the insurer unreasonably and in bad faith withholds payment of the claim of its insured, it is subject to liability in tort. And an insurer cannot reasonably and in good faith deny payments to its insured without fully investigating the grounds for its denial." (*Frommoethelydo v. Fire Insurance Exchange* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 208, 214–215 [228 Cal.Rptr. 160, 721 P.2d 41], internal citation omitted.)

- "To protect [an insured's] interests it is essential that an insurer fully inquire into possible bases that might support the insured's claim. Although we recognize that distinguishing fraudulent from legitimate claims may occasionally be difficult for insurers, ... an insurer cannot reasonably and in good faith deny payments to its insured without thoroughly investigating the foundation for its denial." (*Egan, supra,* 24 Cal.3d at p. 819.)

- "When investigating a claim, an insurance company has a duty to diligently search for evidence which supports its insured's claim. If it seeks to discover only the evidence that defeats the claim it holds its own interest above that of the insured." (*Mariscal v. Old Republic Ins. Co.* (1996) 42 Cal.App.4th 1617, 1620 [50 Cal.Rptr.2d 224].)

- "While we agree with the trial court … that the insurer's interpretation of the language of its policy which led to its original denial of [the insured]'s claim was reasonable, it does not follow that [the insurer]'s resulting claim denial can be justified in the absence of a full, fair and thorough investigation of *all* of the bases of the claim that was presented." (*Jordan v. Allstate Ins. Co.* (2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 1062, 1066 [56 Cal.Rptr.3d 312], original italics.)

- "An unreasonable failure to investigate amounting to ... unfair dealing may be found when an insurer fails to consider, or seek to discover, evidence relevant to the issues of liability and damages. ... [¶] The insurer's willingness to reconsider its denial of coverage and to continue an investigation into a claim has been held to weigh in favor of its good faith." (*Shade Foods, Inc. v. Innovative Products Sales & Marketing, Inc.* (2000) 78 Cal.App.4th 847, 880 [93 Cal.Rptr.2d 364], internal citation omitted.)

- "[The insurer], of course, was not obliged to accept [the doctor]'s opinion without scrutiny or investigation. To the extent it had good faith doubts, the insurer would have been within its rights to investigate the basis for [plaintiff]'s claim by asking [the doctor] to reexamine or further explain his findings, having a physician review all the submitted medical records and offer an opinion, or, if necessary, having its insured examined by other physicians (as it later did). What it could not do, consistent with the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, was *ignore* [the doctor]'s conclusions without any attempt at adequate investigation, and reach contrary conclusions lacking any discernable medical foundation." (*Wilson v. 21st Century Ins. Co.* (2007) 42 Cal.4th 713, 722 [68 Cal.Rptr.3d 746, 171 P.3d 1082], original italics.)

- "[W]hether an insurer breached its duty to investigate [is] a question of fact to be determined by the particular circumstances of each case." (*Paulfrey v. Blue Chip Stamps* (1983) 150 Cal.App.3d 187, 196 [197 Cal.Rptr. 501].)

- "[L]iability in tort arises only if the conduct was unreasonable, that is, without proper cause." (*Rappaport-Scott, supra*, 146 Cal.App.4th at p. 837.)

- "[W]ithout actual presentation of a claim by the insured in compliance with claims procedures contained in the policy, there is no duty imposed on the insurer to investigate the claim." (*California Shoppers, Inc. v. Royal Globe Insurance Co.* (1985) 175 Cal.App.3d 1, 57 [221 Cal.Rptr. 171].)

- "It would seem reasonable that any responsibility to investigate on an insurer's part would not arise unless and until the threshold issue as to whether a claim was filed, or a good faith effort to comply with claims procedure was made, has been determined. In no event could an insured fail to keep his/her part of the bargain in the first instance, and thereafter seek recovery for breach of a duty to pay seeking punitive damages based on an insurer's failure to investigate a nonclaim." (*Paulfrey, supra,* 150 Cal.App.3d at pp. 199–200.)

Secondary Sources

2 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Insurance, § 245

Croskey et al., California Practice Guide: Insurance Litigation (The Rutter Group) ¶¶ 12:848–12:904

1 California Liability Insurance Practice: Claims & Litigation (Cont.Ed.Bar) Investigating the Claim, §§ 9.2-9.3, 9.14–9.22A

2 California Insurance Law & Practice, Ch. 13, *Claims Handling and the Duty of Good Faith,* § 13.04[1]–[3] (Matthew Bender)

2 California Uninsured Motorist Law, Ch. 24, *Bad Faith in Uninsured Motorist Law,* § 24.11 (Matthew Bender)

26 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 308, *Insurance,* § 308.24 (Matthew Bender)

12 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 120, *Insurance,* §§ 120.153, 120.184 (Matthew Bender)

2334. Bad Faith (Third Party)—~~Refusal~~ Failure to Accept Reasonable Settlement Within Liability Policy Limits—Essential Factual Elements

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [he/she/it] was harmed by [***name of defendant***]'s breach of the obligation of good faith and fair dealing because [***name of defendant***] failed to accept a reasonable settlement demand in a lawsuit against [***name of plaintiff***]. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff in underlying case***] brought a lawsuit against [***name of plaintiff***] for a claim that was covered by [***name of defendant***]'s insurance policy;**

2. **That [***name of defendant***] failed to accept a reasonable settlement demand for an amount within policy limits;**

[3. That [*name of defendant***]'s failure to accept this settlement demand was unreasonable;]**

and

~~3~~4. **That a monetary judgment was entered against [***name of plaintiff***] for a sum greater than the policy limits.**

"Policy limits" means the highest amount available under the policy for the claim against [*name of plaintiff***].**

To act or fail to act "unreasonably" means that the insurer had no proper cause for its conduct.

A settlement demand for an amount within policy limits is reasonable, and [*name of defendant***]'s rejection of the demand is unreasonable, if [***name of defendant***] knew or should have known at the time the ~~settlement~~ demand was rejected that the potential judgment was likely to exceed the amount of the ~~settlement~~ demand based on [***name of plaintiff in underlying case***]'s injuries or loss and [***name of plaintiff***]'s probable liability. However, the demand may be unreasonable for reasons other than the amount demanded.**

New September 2003; Revised December 2007, June 2012, December 2012, June 2016

Directions for Use

This instruction is for use in an "excess judgment" case; that is one in which judgment was against the insured for an amount over the policy limits, after the insurer rejected a settlement offer within policy limits. If the insurer accepted coverage, it will be liable for the entire judgment if the settlement offer was reasonable and the insurer's refusal to settle was unreasonable. (*Graciano v. Mercury General Corp.* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 414, 425 [179 Cal.Rptr.3d 717].) In such a case, include element 3. Omit element 3 if the insurer denied coverage, but coverage is in fact established. An insurer who denies

coverage is liable for the entire judgment if coverage is found to exist. (*Johansen v. California State Auto. Asso. Inter-Insurance Bureau* (1975) 15 Cal.3d 9, 15−16 [123 Cal.Rptr. 288, 538 P.2d 744].)

The instructions in this series assume that the plaintiff is the insured and the defendant is the insurer. The party designations may be changed if appropriate to the facts of the case.

~~This instruction is intended for use if the insurer assumed the duty to defend the insured, but failed to accept a reasonable settlement offer. It may also be used if the insurer rejects the defense, but did in fact owe its insured a duty to indemnify (i.e., coverage can be established). (See *Dewitt v. Monterey Ins. Co.* (2012) 204 Cal.App.4th 233, 244 [138 Cal.Rptr.3d 705].)~~ For instructions regarding general breach of contract issues, refer to the Contracts series (CACI No. 300 et seq.).

If it is alleged that a demand was made in excess of limits and there is a claim that the defendant should have contributed the policy limits, then this instruction will need to be modified.

This instruction should also be modified if the insurer did not accept the policy-limits demand because of potential remaining exposure to the insured, such as a contractual indemnity claim or exposure to other claimants.

Sources and Authority

- "[T]he implied obligation of good faith and fair dealing requires the insurer to settle in an appropriate case although the express terms of the policy do not impose such a duty. [¶] The insurer, in deciding whether a claim should be compromised, must take into account the interest of the insured and give it at least as much consideration as it does to its own interest. When there is great risk of a recovery beyond the policy limits so that the most reasonable manner of disposing of the claim is a settlement which can be made within those limits, a consideration in good faith of the insured's interest requires the insurer to settle the claim." (*Comunale v. Traders & General Ins. Co.* (1958) 50 Cal.2d 654, 659 [328 P.2d 198], citation omitted.)

- "Liability is imposed not for a bad faith breach of the contract but for failure to meet the duty to accept reasonable settlements, a duty included within the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing." (*Crisci v. Security Insurance Co. of New Haven, Connecticut* (1967) 66 Cal.2d 425, 430 [58 Cal.Rptr. 13, 426 P.2d 173].)

- "In determining whether an insurer has given consideration to the interests of the insured, the test is whether a prudent insurer without policy limits would have accepted the settlement offer." (*Crisci*, *supra*, 66 Cal.2d at p. 429.)

- "[I]n deciding whether or not to compromise the claim, the insurer must conduct itself as though it alone were liable for the entire amount of the judgment. ... [T]he only permissible consideration in evaluating the reasonableness of the settlement offer becomes whether, in light of the victim's injuries and the probable liability of the insured, the ultimate judgment is likely to exceed the amount of the settlement offer." (*Johansen*, *supra*, ~~*v. California State Auto. Asso. Inter-Insurance Bureau* (1975)~~ 15 Cal.3d at p. ~~9,~~ 16 ~~[123 Cal.Rptr. 288, 538 P.2d 744]~~, internal citation omitted.)

- "[W]henever it is likely that the judgment against the insured will exceed policy limits 'so that the most reasonable manner of disposing of the claim is a settlement which can be made within those limits, a consideration in good faith of the insured's interest requires the insurer to settle the claim.' " (*Johansen*, *supra*, 15 Cal.3d at p. 16.)

- "[A]n insurer is required to act in good faith in dealing with its insured. Thus, in deciding whether or not to settle a claim, the insurer must take into account the interests of the insured, and when there is a great risk of recovery beyond the policy limits, a good faith consideration of the insured's interests may require the insurer to settle the claim within the policy limits. An unreasonable refusal to settle may subject the insurer to liability for the entire amount of the judgment rendered against the insured, including any portion in excess of the policy limits." (*Hamilton v. Maryland Casualty Co.* (2002) 27 Cal.4th 718, 724−725 [117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 318, 41 P.3d 128].)

- "The size of the judgment recovered in the personal injury action when it exceeds the policy limits, although not conclusive, furnishes an inference that the value of the claim is the equivalent of the amount of the judgment and that acceptance of an offer within those limits was the most reasonable method of dealing with the claim." (*Crisci*, *supra*, 66 Cal.2d at p. 431.)

- "The covenant of good faith and fair dealing implied in every insurance policy obligates the insurer, among other things, to accept a reasonable offer to settle a lawsuit by a third party against the insured within policy limits whenever there is a substantial likelihood of a recovery in excess of those limits. The insurer must evaluate the reasonableness of an offer to settle a lawsuit against the insured by considering the probable liability of the insured and the amount of that liability, without regard to any coverage defenses. An insurer that fails to accept a reasonable settlement offer within policy limits will be held liable in tort for the entire judgment against the insured, even if that amount exceeds the policy limits. An insurer's duty to accept a reasonable settlement offer in these circumstances is implied in law to protect the insured from exposure to liability in excess of coverage as a result of the insurer's gamble—on which only the insured might lose." (*Rappaport-Scott v. Interinsurance Exch. of the Auto. Club* (2007) 146 Cal.App.4th 831, 836 [53 Cal.Rptr.3d 245], internal citations omitted.)

- "An insured's claim for bad faith based on an alleged wrongful refusal to settle first requires proof the third party made a reasonable offer to settle the claims against the insured for an amount within the policy limits. The offer satisfies this first element if (1) its terms are clear enough to have created an enforceable contract resolving all claims had it been accepted by the insurer, (2) all of the third party claimants have joined in the demand, (3) it provides for a complete release of all insureds, and (4) the time provided for acceptance did not deprive the insurer of an adequate opportunity to investigate and evaluate its insured's exposure." (*Graciano*, *supra*, ~~*v. Mercury General Corp.* (2014)~~ 231 Cal.App.4th at p.~~414,~~ 425 ~~[179 Cal.Rptr.3d 717]~~, internal citations omitted.)

- "Determination of the reasonableness of a settlement offer for purposes of a reimbursement action is based on the information available to [the insurer] at the time of the proposed settlement." (*Isaacson v. California Ins. Guarantee Assn.* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 775, 793 [244 Cal.Rptr. 655, 750 P.2d 297].)

- "A claim for bad faith based on an alleged wrongful refusal to settle also requires proof the insurer unreasonably failed to accept an otherwise reasonable offer within the time specified by the third party for acceptance." (*Graciano*, *supra*, 231 Cal.App.4th at p. 425.)

- "The third party is entitled to set a reasonable time limit within which the insurer must accept the settlement proposal … ." (*Graciano, supra,* 231 Cal.App.4th at p. 434.)

- "Whether [the insurer] 'refused' the 'offer,' and whether it could reasonably have acted otherwise in light of the 11-day deadline imposed by the offer's terms, were questions for the jury." (*Coe v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.* (1977) 66 Cal.App.3d 981, 994 [136 Cal.Rptr. 331].)

- "A cause of action for bad faith refusal to settle arises only after a judgment has been rendered in excess of the policy limits. ... Until judgment is actually entered, the mere possibility or probability of an excess judgment does not render the refusal to settle actionable." (*Safeco Ins. Co. of Am. v. Superior Court* (1999) 71 Cal.App.4th 782, 788 [84 Cal.Rptr.2d 43], internal citations omitted.)

- "An insurer's wrongful failure to settle may be actionable even without rendition of an excess judgment. An insured may recover for bad faith failure to settle, despite the lack of an excess judgment, where the insurer's misconduct goes beyond a simple failure to settle within policy limits or the insured suffers consequential damages apart from an excess judgment." (*Howard v. American National Fire Ins. Co.* (2010) 187 Cal.App.4th 498, 527 [115 Cal.Rptr.3d 42], internal citations omitted.)

- " 'An insurer who denies coverage *does so at its own risk and although its position may not have been entirely groundless*, if the denial is found to be wrongful it is liable for the full amount which will compensate the insured for all the detriment caused by the insurer's breach of the express and implied obligations of the contract.' Accordingly, contrary to the defendant's suggestion, an insurer's 'good faith,' though erroneous, belief in noncoverage affords no defense to liability flowing from the insurer's refusal to accept a reasonable settlement offer." (*Johansen, supra,* 15 Cal.3d at pp. 15−16, original italics, footnotes and internal citation omitted.)

- "~~[A]n insurer who refused a reasonable settlement offer, on the ground of no coverage, does so at its own risk, so that the insurer has no defense that its refusal was in good faith if coverage is, in fact, found. However, w~~[W]here the *kind* of claim asserted is not covered by the insurance contract (and not simply the *amount* of the claim), an insurer has no obligation to pay money in settlement of a noncovered claim, because 'The insurer does not … insure the entire range of an insured's well-being, outside the scope of and unrelated to the insurance policy, with respect to paying third party claims.…' " (*Dewitt v. Monterey Ins. Co.* (2012) 204 Cal.App.4th 233, 244 [138 Cal.Rptr.3d 705]~~*DeWitt, supra,* 204 Cal.App.4th at p. 244~~, original italics.)

- "A good faith belief in noncoverage is not relevant to a determination of the reasonableness of a settlement offer." (*Samson v. Transamerica Insurance Co.* (1981) 30 Cal.3d 220, 243 [178 Cal.Rptr. 343, 636 P.2d 32], internal citation omitted.)

- "An insurer that breaches its duty of reasonable settlement is liable for all the insured's damages proximately caused by the breach, regardless of policy limits. Where the underlying action has proceeded to trial and a judgment in excess of the policy limits has been entered against the insured, the insurer is ordinarily liable to its insured for the entire amount of that judgment, excluding any punitive damages awarded." (*Hamilton v. Maryland Casualty Co.* (2002) 27 Cal.4th 718, 725 [117

Cal.Rptr.2d 318, 41 P.3d 128], internal citations omitted.)

- "[I]nsurers do have a 'selfish' interest (that is, one that is peculiar to themselves) in imposing a blanket rule which effectively precludes disclosure of policy limits, and that interest can adversely affect the possibility that an excess claim against a policyholder might be settled within policy limits. Thus, a palpable conflict of interest exists in at least one context where there is no formal settlement offer. We therefore conclude that a formal settlement offer is not an absolute prerequisite to a bad faith action in the wake of an excess verdict when the claimant makes a request for policy limits and the insurer refuses to contact the policyholder about the request." (*Boicourt v. Amex Assurance Co.* (2000) 78 Cal.App.4th 1390, 1398−1399 [93 Cal.Rptr.3d 763].)

- "For bad faith liability to attach to an insurer's failure to pursue settlement discussions, in a case where the insured is exposed to a judgment beyond policy limits, there must be, at a minimum, some evidence either that the injured party has communicated to the insurer an interest in settlement, or some other circumstance demonstrating the insurer knew that settlement within policy limits could feasibly be negotiated. In the absence of such evidence, or evidence the insurer by its conduct has actively foreclosed the possibility of settlement, there is no "opportunity to settle" that an insurer may be taxed with ignoring." (*Reid v. Mercury Ins. Co.* (2013) 220 Cal.App.4th 262, 272 [162 Cal.Rptr.3d 894].)

Secondary Sources

2 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Insurance, §§ 257–258

Croskey et al., California Practice Guide: Insurance Litigation, Ch. 12B-A, *Implied Covenant Liability—Introduction*, ¶¶ 12:202–12:224 (The Rutter Group)

Croskey et al., California Practice Guide: Insurance Litigation, Ch. 12B-B, *Bad Faith Refusal To Settle*, ¶¶ 12:226–12:548 (The Rutter Group)

Croskey et al., California Practice Guide: Insurance Litigation, Ch. 12B-C, *Bad Faith Liability Despite Settlement Of Third Party Claims*, ¶¶ 12:575–12:581.12 (The Rutter Group)

Croskey et al., California Practice Guide: Insurance Litigation, Ch. 12B-D, *Refusal To Defend Cases*, ¶¶ 12:582–12:686, (The Rutter Group)

2 California Liability Insurance Practice: Claims and Litigation (Cont.Ed.Bar) Actions for Failure to Settle, §§ 26.1–26.35

2 California Insurance Law and Practice, Ch. 13, *Claims Handling and the Duty of Good Faith*, § 13.07[1]–[3] (Matthew Bender)

26 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 308, *Insurance*, § 308.24 (Matthew Bender)

12 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 120, *Insurance*, §§ 120.195, 120.199, 120.205, 120.207 (Matthew Bender)

2505. Retaliation—Essential Factual Elements (Gov. Code, § 12940(h))

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] retaliated against [him/her] for [***describe activity protected by the FEHA***]. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***] [***describe protected activity***];**

2. **[That [***name of defendant***] [discharged/demoted/[***specify other adverse employment action***]] [***name of plaintiff***];]**

   [**or**]

   [That [*name of defendant***] subjected [***name of plaintiff***] to an adverse employment action;]**

   [**or**]

   [That [*name of plaintiff***] was constructively discharged;]**

3. **That [***name of plaintiff***]'s [***describe protected activity***] was a substantial motivating reason for [***name of defendant***]'s [decision to [discharge/demote/[***specify other adverse employment action***]] [***name of plaintiff***]/conduct];**

4. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

5. **That [***name of defendant***]'s [decision to [discharge/demote/[***specify other adverse employment action***] [***name of plaintiff***]~~conduct~~ was a substantial factor in causing [~~*name of plaintiff*~~]~~'s~~ [him/her] harm.**

[If [*name of plaintiff***] establishes the elements above, [he/she] does not have to prove [discrimination/harassment/[***specify other protected activity***]] in order to be protected from retaliation. If [he/she] [reasonably believed that [***name of defendant***]'s conduct was unlawful/requested a [disability/religious] accommodation], [he/she] may prevail on a retaliation claim even if [he/she] does not prevail on a separate claim for [discrimination/harassment/[***other***]].]**

New September 2003; Revised August 2007, April 2008, October 2008, April 2009, June 2010, June 2012, December 2012, June 2013, June 2014, June 2016

Directions for Use

In elements 1 and 3, describe the protected activity in question. Government Code section 12940(h) provides that it is unlawful to retaliate against a person "because the person has opposed any practices forbidden under [Government Code sections 12900 through 12966] or because the person has filed a complaint, testified, or assisted in any proceeding under [the FEHA]." It is also unlawful to retaliate or

otherwise discriminate against a person for requesting a reasonable accommodation for religious practice or disability, regardless of whether the request was granted. (Gov. Code, § 12940(*l*)(4) [religious practice], (m)(2) [disability].)

Read the first option for element 2 if there is no dispute as to whether the employer's acts constituted an adverse employment action. Read the second option and also give CACI No. 2509, *"Adverse Employment Action" Explained*, if whether there was an adverse employment action is a question of fact for the jury. For example, the case may involve a pattern of employer harassment consisting of acts that might not individually be sufficient to constitute retaliation, but taken as a whole establish prohibited conduct. (See *Yanowitz v. L'Oreal USA, Inc.* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 1028, 1052–1056 [32 Cal.Rptr.3d 436, 116 P.3d 1123].) Give both the first and second options if the employee presents evidence supporting liability under both a sufficient-single-act theory or a pattern-of-harassment theory. (See, e.g., *Wysinger v. Automobile Club of Southern California* (2007) 157 Cal.App.4th 413, 423–424 [69 Cal.Rptr.3d 1].) Also select "conduct" in element 3 if the second option or both the first and second options are included for element 2.

Retaliation in violation of the FEHA may be established by constructive discharge; that is, that the employer intentionally created or knowingly permitted working conditions to exist that were so intolerable that a reasonable person in the employee's position would have had no reasonable alternative other than to resign. (See *Steele v. Youthful Offender Parole Bd.* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 1241, 1253 [76 Cal.Rptr.3d 632].) If constructive discharge is alleged, give the third option for element 2 and also give CACI No. 2510, *"Constructive Discharge" Explained*. Also select "conduct" in element 3 if the third option is included for element 2.

Element 3 requires that the protected activity be a substantial motivating reason for the retaliatory acts. (See *Harris v. City of Santa Monica* (2013) 56 Cal.4th 203, 232 [152 Cal.Rptr.3d 392, 294 P.3d 49]; *Alamo v. Practice Management Information Corp.* (2013) 219 Cal.App.4th 466, 479 [161 Cal.Rptr.3d 758]; see also CACI No. 2507, *"Substantial Motivating Reason" Explained*.)

Note that there are two causation elements. There must be a causal link between the retaliatory animus and the adverse action (see element 3), and there must be a causal link between the adverse action and damages (see element 5). (See *Mamou v. Trendwest Resorts, Inc.* (2008) 165 Cal.App.4th 686, 713 [81 Cal.Rptr.3d 406].)

This instruction has been criticized in dictum because it is alleged that there is no element requiring retaliatory intent. (See *Joaquin v. City of Los Angeles* (2012) 202 Cal.App.4th 1207, 1229–1231 [136 Cal.Rptr.3d 472].) The court urged the Judicial Council to redraft the instruction and the corresponding special verdict form so as to clearly state that retaliatory intent is a necessary element of a retaliation claim under FEHA. The jury in the case was instructed per element 3 "that Richard Joaquin's reporting that he had been sexually harassed was a motivating reason for the City of Los Angeles' decision to terminate Richard Joaquin's employment or deny Richard Joaquin promotion to the rank of sergeant." The committee believes that the instruction as given is correct for the intent element in a retaliation case. However, in cases such as *Joaquin* that involve allegations of a prohibited motivating reason (based on a report of sexual harassment) and a permitted motivating reason (based on a good faith belief that the report was falsified), the instruction may need to be modified to make it clear that plaintiff must prove that defendant acted based on the *prohibited* motivating reason and not the *permitted* motivating reason.

Sources and Authority

- Retaliation Prohibited Under Fair Employment and Housing Act. Government Code section 12940(h).
- Retaliation for Requesting Reasonable Accommodation for Religious Practice and Disability Prohibited. Government Code section 12940(*l*)(4), (m)(2).
- "Person" Defined Under Fair Employment and Housing Act. Government Code section 12925(d).
- Prohibited Retaliation. Title 2 California Code of Regulations section 11021.
- "[I]n order to establish a prima facie case of retaliation under the FEHA, a plaintiff must show (1) he or she engaged in a 'protected activity,' (2) the employer subjected the employee to an adverse employment action, and (3) a causal link existed between the protected activity and the employer's action. Once an employee establishes a prima facie case, the employer is required to offer a legitimate, nonretaliatory reason for the adverse employment action. If the employer produces a legitimate reason for the adverse employment action, the presumption of retaliation ' " 'drops out of the picture,' " ' and the burden shifts back to the employee to prove intentional retaliation." (*Yanowitz, supra*, 36 Cal.4th at p. 1042, internal citations omitted.)
- "Actions for retaliation are 'inherently fact-driven'; it is the jury, not the court, that is charged with determining the facts." (*McCoy v. Pacific Maritime Assn.* (2013) 216 Cal.App.4th 283, 299 [156 Cal.Rptr.3d 851].)
- "It is well established that a plaintiff in a retaliation case need only prove that a retaliatory animus was at least a substantial or motivating factor in the adverse employment decision." (*George v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd.* (2009) 179 Cal.App.4th 1475, 1492 [102 Cal.Rptr.3d 431].)
- "Retaliation claims are inherently fact-specific, and the impact of an employer's action in a particular case must be evaluated in context. Accordingly, although an adverse employment action must materially affect the terms, conditions, or privileges of employment to be actionable, the determination of whether a particular action or course of conduct rises to the level of actionable conduct should take into account the unique circumstances of the affected employee as well as the workplace context of the claim." (*Yanowitz, supra,* 36 Cal.4th at p. 1052.)
- "Contrary to [defendant]'s assertion that it is improper to consider collectively the alleged retaliatory acts, there is no requirement that an employer's retaliatory acts constitute one swift blow, rather than a series of subtle, yet damaging, injuries. Enforcing a requirement that each act separately constitute an adverse employment action would subvert the purpose and intent of the statute." (*Yanowitz, supra*, 36 Cal.4th at pp. 1055–1056, internal citations omitted.)
- "Clearly, section 12940, subdivision (h) encompasses a broad range of protected activity. An employee need not use specific legal terms or buzzwords in opposing discrimination. Nor is it

necessary for an employee to file a formal charge. The protected activity element may be established by evidence that the plaintiff threatened to file a discrimination charge, by a showing that the plaintiff mistakenly, but reasonably and sincerely believed he was opposing discrimination, or by evidence an employer believed the plaintiff was a potential witness in another employee's FEHA action." (*Rope v. Auto-Chlor System of Washington, Inc.* (2013) 220 Cal.App.4th 635, 652 [163 Cal.Rptr.3d 392], internal citations and footnote omitted.)

- "But protected activity does not include a mere request for reasonable accommodation. Without more, exercising one's rights under FEHA to request reasonable accommodation or engage in the interactive process does not demonstrate some degree of opposition to or protest of unlawful conduct by the employer." (*Nealy v. City of Santa Monica* (2015) 234 Cal.App.4th 359, 381 [184 Cal.Rptr.3d 9], internal citation omitted.)

- "Moreover, [defendant]'s actions had a substantial and material impact on the conditions of employment. The refusal to promote [plaintiff] is an adverse employment action under FEHA. There was also a pattern of conduct, the totality of which constitutes an adverse employment action. This includes undeserved negative job reviews, reductions in his staff, ignoring his health concerns and acts which caused him substantial psychological harm." (*Wysinger, supra,* 157 Cal.App.4th at p. 424, internal citations omitted.)

- "A long period between an employer's adverse employment action and the employee's earlier protected activity may lead to the inference that the two events are not causally connected. But if between these events the employer engages in a pattern of conduct consistent with a retaliatory intent, there may be a causal connection." (*Wysinger, supra,* 157 Cal.App.4th at p. 421, internal citation omitted.)

- "Both direct and circumstantial evidence can be used to show an employer's intent to retaliate. 'Direct evidence of retaliation may consist of remarks made by decisionmakers displaying a retaliatory motive.' Circumstantial evidence typically relates to such factors as the plaintiff's job performance, the timing of events, and how the plaintiff was treated in comparison to other workers." (*Colarossi v. Coty US Inc.* (2002) 97 Cal.App.4th 1142, 1153 [119 Cal.Rptr.2d 131], internal citations omitted.)

- "The retaliatory motive is 'proved by showing that plaintiff engaged in protected activities, that his employer was aware of the protected activities, and that the adverse action followed within a relatively short time thereafter.' 'The causal link may be established by an inference derived from circumstantial evidence, "such as the employer's knowledge that the [employee] engaged in protected activities and the proximity in time between the protected action and allegedly retaliatory employment decision." ' " (*Fisher v. San Pedro Peninsula Hospital* (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 590, 615 [262 Cal.Rptr. 842], internal citations omitted.)

- "[A]n employer generally can be held liable for the retaliatory actions of its supervisors." (*Wysinger, supra,* 157 Cal.App.4th at p. 420.)

- "Plaintiff, although a partner, is a person whom section 12940, subdivision (h) protects from retaliation for opposing the partnership-employer's harassment against those employees." (*Fitzsimons*

v. California Emergency Physicians Medical Group (2012) 205 Cal.App.4th 1423, 1429 [141 Cal.Rptr.3d 265].)

- "[A]n employer may be found to have engaged in an adverse employment action, and thus liable for retaliation under section 12940(h), 'by permitting … fellow employees to punish [him] for invoking [his] rights.' We therefore hold that an employer may be held liable for coworker retaliatory conduct if the employer knew or should have known of coworker retaliatory conduct and either participated and encouraged the conduct, or failed to take reasonable actions to end the retaliatory conduct." (*Kelley v. The Conco Cos.* (2011) 196 Cal.App.4th 191, 213 [126 Cal.Rptr.3d 651], internal citation omitted.)

- "[T]he employer is liable for retaliation under section 12940, subdivision (h), but nonemployer individuals are not personally liable for their role in that retaliation." (*Jones v. The Lodge at Torrey Pines Partnership* (2008) 42 Cal.4th 1158, 1173 [72 Cal.Rptr.3d 624, 177 P.3d 232].)

- "[U]nder certain circumstances, a retaliation claim may be brought by an employee who has complained of or opposed conduct, even when a court or jury subsequently determines the conduct actually was not prohibited by the FEHA. Indeed, this precept is well settled. An employee is protected against retaliation if the employee reasonably and in good faith believed that what he or she was opposing constituted unlawful employer conduct such as sexual harassment or sexual discrimination." (*Miller v. Department of Corr.* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 446,. 473–474 [30 Cal.Rptr.3d 797, 115 P.3d 77], internal citations omitted.)

- " 'The legislative purpose underlying FEHA's prohibition against retaliation is to prevent employers from deterring employees from asserting good faith discrimination complaints … .' Employer retaliation against employees who are believed to be prospective complainants or witnesses for complainants undermines this legislative purpose just as effectively as retaliation after the filing of a complaint. To limit FEHA in such a way would be to condone 'an absurd result' that is contrary to legislative intent. We agree with the trial court that FEHA protects employees against preemptive retaliation by the employer." (*Steele, supra,* 162 Cal.App.4th at p. 1255, internal citations omitted.)

- "Government Code section 12940, subdivision (h), does not shield an employee against termination or lesser discipline for either lying or withholding information during an employer's internal investigation of a discrimination claim. In other words, public policy does not protect deceptive activity during an internal investigation. Such conduct is a legitimate reason to terminate an at-will employee." (*McGrory v. Applied Signal Technology, Inc.* (2013) 212 Cal.App.4th 1510, 1528 [152 Cal.Rptr.3d 154], footnotes omitted.)

- "Although appellant does not argue she was constructively discharged, such a claim is not necessary to find unlawful retaliation." (*McCoy, supra,* 216 Cal.App.4th at p. 301.)

Secondary Sources

8 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Constitutional Law, §§ 922, 940, 941

Chin et al., California Practice Guide: Employment Litigation, Ch. 7-A, *Title VII And The California Fair*

Employment And Housing Act, ¶¶ 7:680–7:841 (The Rutter Group)

1 Wrongful Employment Termination Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) Discrimination Claims, §§ 2.83–2.88

2 Wilcox, California Employment Law, Ch. 41, *Substantive Requirements Under Equal Employment Opportunity Laws*, § 41.131 (Matthew Bender)

11 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 115, *Civil Rights: Employment Discrimination*, §§ 115.37, 115.94 (Matthew Bender)

California Civil Practice: Employment Litigation, §§ 2:74–2:75 (Thomson Reuters)

2506. Limitation on Remedies~~Affirmative Defense~~—After-Acquired Evidence

[*Name of defendant***] claims that [he/she/it] would have discharged [***name of plaintiff***] anyway if [he/she/it] had known that [***name of plaintiff***] [***describe misconduct***]. You must decide whether [***name of defendant***] has proved all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***] [***describe misconduct***];**

2. **That [***name of plaintiff***]'s misconduct was sufficiently severe that [***name of defendant***] would have discharged [him/her] because of that misconduct alone had [***name of defendant***] known of it; and**

3. **That [***name of defendant***] would have discharged [***name of plaintiff***] for [his/her] misconduct as a matter of settled company policy.**

New September 2003; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

The after-acquired-evidence doctrine is an equitable defense that is determined by the court based on the facts of the case. This instruction assists the judge ~~where~~ if the facts are in dispute. (See, e.g., *Thompson v. Tracor Flight Systems, Inc.* (2001) 86 Cal.App.4th 1156, 1173 [104 Cal.Rptr.2d 95].) After-acquired evidence is not a complete defense to liability, but may foreclose otherwise available remedies. (*Salas v. Sierra Chemical Co.* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 407, 430−431 [173 Cal.Rptr.3d 689, 327 P.3d 797].) It is not clear if there is a role for the jury in deciding what remedies are available.

After-acquired evidence cases must be distinguished from mixed motive cases in which the employer at the time of the employment action has two or more motives, at least one of which is unlawful. (See *Salas supra*, 59 Cal.4th at p. 430; CACI No. 2512, *Limitation on Remedies—Same Decision*.)

Sources and Authority

- "In general, the after-acquired-evidence doctrine shields an employer from liability or limits available relief where, after a termination, the employer learns for the first time about employee wrongdoing that would have led to the discharge in any event. Employee wrongdoing in after-acquired-evidence cases generally falls into one of two categories: (1) misrepresentations on a resume or job application; or (2) posthire, on-the-job misconduct." (*Camp v. Jeffer, Mangels, Butler & Marmaro* (1995) 35 Cal.App.4th 620, 632 [41 Cal.Rptr.2d 329].)

- "The after-acquired-evidence doctrine serves as a complete or partial defense to an employee's claim of wrongful discharge ... To invoke this doctrine, '... the employer must establish "that the wrongdoing was of such severity that the employee in fact would have been terminated on those grounds alone if the employer had known of it" ... [T]he employer ... must show that such a firing would have taken place as a matter of "settled" company policy.' " (*Murillo v. Rite Stuff Foods, Inc.*

(1998) 65 Cal.App.4th 833, 842, 845-846 [77 Cal.Rptr.2d 12], internal citations omitted.)

- "Where an employer seeks to rely upon after-acquired evidence of wrongdoing, it must first establish that the wrongdoing was of such severity that the employee in fact would have been terminated on those grounds alone if the employer had known of it at the time of the discharge." (*McKennon v. Nashville Banner Publishing Co.* (1995) 513 U.S. 352, 362-363 [115 S.Ct. 879, 130 L.Ed.2d 852].)

- "Courts must tread carefully in applying the after-acquired-evidence doctrine to discrimination claims ... . Where, as here, the discriminatory conduct was pervasive during the term of employment, therefore, it would not be sound public policy to bar recovery for injuries suffered while employed. In applying the after-acquired-evidence doctrine, the equities between employer and employee can be balanced by barring all portions of the employment discrimination claim tied to the employee's discharge." (*Murillo*, *supra*, 65 Cal.App.4th at pp. 849–850.)

- "As the Supreme Court recognized in *McKennon*, the use of after-acquired evidence must 'take due account of the lawful prerogatives of the employer in the usual course of its business and the corresponding equities that it has arising from the employee's wrongdoing.' We appreciate that the facts in *McKennon* ... presented a situation where balancing the equities should permit a finding of employer liability-to reinforce the importance of antidiscrimination laws-while limiting an employee's damages-to take account of an employer's business prerogatives. However, the equities compel a different result where an employee who is disqualified from employment by government-imposed requirements nevertheless obtains a job by misrepresenting the pertinent qualifications. In such a situation, the employee should have no recourse for an alleged wrongful termination of employment." (*Camp*, *supra*, 35 Cal.App.4th at pp. 637-638, internal citation omitted.)

- "We decline to adopt a blanket rule that material falsification of an employment application is a complete defense to a claim that the employer, while still unaware of the falsification, terminated the employment in violation of the employee's legal rights." (*Cooper v. Rykoff-Sexton, Inc.* (1994) 24 Cal.App.4th 614, 617 [29 Cal.Rptr.2d 642].)

- "The doctrine [of after-acquired evidence] is the basis for an equitable defense related to the traditional defense of 'unclean hands' ... [¶] In the present case, there were conflicts in the evidence concerning respondent's actions, her motivations, and the possible consequences of her actions within appellant's disciplinary system. The trial court submitted those factual questions to the jury for resolution and then used the resulting special verdict as the basis for concluding appellant was not entitled to equitable reduction of the damages award." (*Thompson, supra,* 86 Cal.App.4th at p. 1173.)

- "By definition, after-acquired evidence is not known to the employer at the time of the allegedly unlawful termination or refusal to hire. In after-acquired evidence cases, the employer's alleged wrongful act in violation of the FEHA's strong public policy precedes the employer's discovery of information that would have justified the employer's decision. To allow such after-acquired evidence to be a complete defense would eviscerate the public policies embodied in the FEHA by allowing an employer to engage in invidious employment discrimination with total impunity." (*Salas*, *supra*, 59 Cal.4th at p. 430.)

- "In after-acquired evidence cases, therefore, both the employee's rights and the employer's

prerogatives deserve recognition. The relative equities will vary from case to case, depending on the nature and consequences of any wrongdoing on either side, a circumstance that counsels against rigidity in fashioning appropriate remedies in those actions where an employer relies on after-acquired evidence to defeat an employee's FEHA claims." (*Salas*, *supra*, 59 Cal.4th at p. 430.)

- "Generally, the employee's remedies should not afford compensation for loss of employment during the period after the employer's discovery of the evidence relating to the employee's wrongdoing. When the employer shows that information acquired after the employee's claim has been made would have led to a lawful discharge or other employment action, remedies such as reinstatement, promotion, and pay for periods after the employer learned of such information would be 'inequitable and pointless,' as they grant remedial relief for a period during which the plaintiff employee was no longer in the defendant's employment and had no right to such employment. (*Salas*, *supra*, 59 Cal.4th at pp. 430−431.)

- The remedial relief generally should compensate the employee for loss of employment from the date of wrongful discharge or refusal to hire to the date on which the employer acquired information of the employee's wrongdoing or ineligibility for employment. Fashioning remedies based on the relative equities of the parties prevents the employer from violating California's FEHA with impunity while also preventing an employee or job applicant from obtaining lost wages compensation for a period during which the employee or applicant would not in any event have been employed by the employer. In an appropriate case, it would also prevent an employee from recovering any lost wages when the employee's wrongdoing is particularly egregious." (*Salas*, *supra*, 59 Cal.4th at p. 431, footnote omitted.)

Secondary Sources

3 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Agency and Employment, § 211

Chin et al., Cal. Practice Guide: Employment Litigation (The Rutter Group) ¶¶ 7:930–7:932, 16:615–16:616, 16:625, 16:635–16:637, 16:647

1 Wrongful Employment Termination Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) Discrimination Claims, § 2.107

2 Wilcox, California Employment Law, Ch. 41, *Substantive Requirements Under Equal Employment Opportunity Laws*, § 41.92 (Matthew Bender)

11 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 115, *Civil Rights: Employment Discrimination*, § 115.54[2] (Matthew Bender)

California Civil Practice: Employment Litigation ~~(Thomson West)~~ § 2:88 (Thomson Reuters)

2512. Limitation on Remedies—Same Decision

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [he/she] was [discharged/[***other adverse employment action***]] because of [his/her] [***protected status or action, e.g., race, gender, or age***], which is an unlawful [discriminatory/retaliatory] reason. [***Name of defendant***] claims that [***name of plaintiff***] [was discharged/[***other adverse employment action***]] because of [***specify reason, e.g., plaintiff's poor job performance***], which is a lawful reason.**

If you find that [discrimination/retaliation] was a substantial motivating reason for [*name of plaintiff***]'s [discharge/[***other adverse employment action***]], you must then consider [***name of defendant***]'s stated reason for the [discharge/[***other adverse employment action***]].**

If you find that [*e.g., plaintiff's poor job performance***] was also a substantial motivating reason, then you must determine whether the defendant has proven that [he/she/it] would have [discharged/[***other adverse employment action***]] [***name of plaintiff***] anyway at that time based on [***e.g., plaintiff's poor job performance***] even if [he/she/it] had not also been substantially motivated by [discrimination/retaliation].**

In determining whether [*e.g., plaintiff's poor job performance***] was a substantial motivating reason, determine what actually motivated [***name of defendant***], not what [he/she/it] might have been justified in doing.**

If you find that [*name of defendant***] [discharged/[***other adverse employment action***]] [***name of plaintiff***] ~~only~~ for a [discriminatory/retaliatory] reason, you will be asked to determine the amount of damages that [he/she] is entitled to recover. If, however, you find that [***name of defendant***] would have [discharged/[***other adverse employment action***]] [***name of plaintiff***] anyway at that time for [***specify defendant's nondiscriminatory/nonretaliatory reason***], then [***name of plaintiff***] will not be entitled to reinstatement, back pay, or damages.**

New December 2013; Revised June 2015, June 2016

Directions for Use

Give this instruction along with CACI No. 2507, *"Substantial Motivating Reason" Explained*, if the employee has presented sufficient evidence for the jury to find that the employer took adverse action against him or her for a prohibited reason, but the employer has presented sufficient evidence for the jury to find that it had a legitimate reason for the action. In such a "mixed-motive" case, the employer is relieved from an award of damages, but may still be liable for attorney fees and costs and injunctive relief. (See *Harris v. City of Santa Monica* (2013) 56 Cal.4th 203, 211 [152 Cal.Rptr.3d 392, 294 P.3d 49].)

Mixed-motive must be distinguished from pretext though both require evaluation of the same evidence, i.e., the employer's purported legitimate reason for the adverse action. In a pretext case, the only actual motive is the discriminatory one and the purported legitimate reasons are fabricated in order to disguise

the true motive. (See *City and County of San Francisco v. Fair Employment and Housing Com.* (1987) 191 Cal.App.3d 976, 985 [236 Cal.Rptr. 716].) The employee has the burden of proving pretext. (*Harris, supra,* 56 Cal.4th at pp. 214−215.) If the employee proves discrimination or retaliation and also pretext, the employer is liable for all potential remedies including damages. But if the employee proves discrimination or retaliation but fails to prove pretext, then a mixed-motive case is presented. To avoid an award of damages, the employer then has the burden of proving that it would have made the same decision anyway solely for the legitimate reason, even though it may have also discriminated or retaliated.

Sources and Authority

- "[U]nder the FEHA, when a jury finds that unlawful discrimination was a substantial factor motivating a termination of employment, and when the employer proves it would have made the same decision absent such discrimination, a court may not award damages, backpay, or an order of reinstatement. But the employer does not escape liability. In light of the FEHA's express purpose of not only redressing but also preventing and deterring unlawful discrimination in the workplace, the plaintiff in this circumstance could still be awarded, where appropriate, declaratory relief or injunctive relief to stop discriminatory practices. In addition, the plaintiff may be eligible for reasonable attorney's fees and costs." (*Harris, supra,* 56 Cal.4th at p. 211.)

- "Because employment discrimination litigation does not resemble the kind of cases in which we have applied the clear and convincing standard, we hold that preponderance of the evidence is the standard of proof applicable to an employer's same-decision showing" (*Harris, supra,* 53 Cal.4th at p. 239.)

- "[W]hen we refer to a same-decision showing, we mean proof that the employer, in the absence of any discrimination, would have made the same decision *at the time it made its actual decision*." (*Harris, supra,* 56 Cal.4th at p. 224, original italics.)

- "In light of today's decision, a jury in a mixed-motive case alleging unlawful termination should be instructed that it must find the employer's action was substantially motivated by discrimination before the burden shifts to the employer to make a same-decision showing, and that a same-decision showing precludes an award of reinstatement, backpay, or damages." (*Harris, supra,* 56 Cal.4th at p. 241.)

- "We do not suggest that discrimination must be alone sufficient to bring about an employment decision in order to constitute a substantial motivating factor. But it is important to recognize that discrimination can be serious, consequential, and even by itself determinative of an employment decision without also being a 'but for' cause." (*Harris, supra,* 56 Cal.4th at p. 229.)

- "[A] plaintiff has the initial burden to make a prima facie case of discrimination by showing that it is more likely than not that the employer has taken an adverse employment action based on a prohibited criterion. A prima facie case establishes a presumption of discrimination. The employer may rebut the presumption by producing evidence that its action was taken for a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason. If the employer discharges this burden, the presumption of

discrimination disappears. The plaintiff must then show that the employer's proffered nondiscriminatory reason was actually a pretext for discrimination, and the plaintiff may offer any other evidence of discriminatory motive. The ultimate burden of persuasion on the issue of discrimination remains with the plaintiff." (*Harris, supra,* 56 Cal.4th at pp. 214−215.)

- " '[Plaintiff] further argues that for equitable reasons, an employer that wishes to make a same-decision showing must concede that it had mixed motives for taking the adverse employment action instead of denying a discriminatory motive altogether. But there is no inconsistency when an employer argues that its motive for discharging an employee was legitimate, while also arguing, contingently, that if the trier of fact finds a mixture of lawful and unlawful motives, then its lawful motive alone would have led to the discharge.' " (*Thornbrough v. Western Placer Unified School Dist.* (2013) 223 Cal.App.4th 169, 199 [167 Cal.Rptr.3d 24] [quoting *Harris, supra,* 56 Cal.App.4th at p. 240].)

- "As a preliminary matter, we reject [defendant]'s claim that the jury could have found no liability on the part of [defendant] had it been properly instructed on the mixed-motive defense at trial. As discussed, the Supreme Court in *Harris* held that the mixed-motive defense is available under the FEHA, but only as a limitation on remedies and not as a complete defense to liability. Consequently, when the plaintiff proves by a preponderance of the evidence that discrimination was a substantial motivating factor in the adverse employment decision, the employer is liable under the FEHA. When the employer proves by a preponderance of the evidence that it would have made the same decision even in the absence of such discrimination, the employer is still liable under the FEHA, but the plaintiff's remedies are then limited to declaratory or injunctive relief, and where appropriate, attorney's fees and costs. As presently drafted, BAJI No. 12.26 does not accurately set forth the parameters of the defense as articulated by the Supreme Court, but rather states that, in a mixed-motive case, 'the employer is not liable if it can establish by a preponderance of the evidence that its legitimate reason, standing alone, would have induced it to make the same decision.' By providing that the mixed-motive defense, if proven, is a complete defense to liability, [defendant]'s requested instruction directly conflicts with the holding in *Harris*. (*Alamo v. Practice Management Information Corp.* (2013) 219 Cal.App.4th 466, 481 [161 Cal.Rptr.3d 758], internal citations omitted.)

- "Pretext may … be inferred from the timing of the company's termination decision, by the identity of the person making the decision, and by the terminated employee's job performance before termination." (*Nazir v. United Airlines, Inc.* (2009) 178 Cal.App.4th 243, 272 [100 Cal.Rptr.3d 296].)

Secondary Sources

8 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Constitutional Law, §§ 928, 950

7 Witkin, California Procedure (5th ed. 2008), Judgment § 217

3 Wilcox, California Employment Law, Ch. 41, *Substantive Requirements Under Equal Employment Opportunity Laws,* § 41.11 (Matthew Bender)

11 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 115, *Civil Rights: Employment Discrimination*, § 115.23 (Matthew Bender)

2548. Disability Discrimination—Refusal to Make Reasonable Accommodation in Housing

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] refused to reasonably accommodate [his/her] [***select term to describe basis of limitations, e.g., physical condition***] as necessary to afford [him/her] an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] was the [***specify defendant's source of authority to provide housing, e.g., owner***] of a rental unit;**

2. **That [***name of plaintiff***] [applied to rent/was living in] the unit;**

3. **That [***name of plaintiff***] had [a history of having] [a] [***e.g., physical condition***] [that limited [***insert major life activity***]];**

4. **That [***name of defendant***] knew of, or should have known of, [***name of plaintiff***]'s disability;**

5. **That in order to afford [***name of plaintiff***] an equal opportunity to use and enjoy the unit, it was necessary to [***specify accommodation required***];**

6. **That [***name of plaintiff***] agreed to pay for any modifications to the unit needed to afford [***name of plaintiff***] an equal opportunity to use and enjoy the unit;**

7. **That [***name of plaintiff***] agreed that, at the end of the tenancy, [he/she] would restore the interior of the unit to the condition that existed before the modifications, other than for reasonable wear and tear; and**

8. **That [***name of defendant***] refused to make this accommodation.**

New June 2016

Directions for Use

This instruction is for use in a case alleging discrimination in housing based on a failure to reasonably accommodate a disability. Under the Fair Employment and Housing Act, "discrimination" includes the refusal to permit, at the expense of the disabled person, reasonable modifications of existing premises occupied or to be occupied by the disabled person, if the modifications may be necessary to afford the disabled person full enjoyment of the premises. (Gov. Code, § 12927(c)(1).)

"Discrimination" also includes refusal to make reasonable accommodations in rules, policies, practices, or services when these accommodations may be necessary to afford a disabled person equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling. (Gov. Code, § 12927(c)(1).) If the claim is based on the landlord's rules, policies, practices, or services rather than on the need for a physical modification of the premises, explain the accommodation required in element 5, and omit elements 6 and 7.

Sources and Authority

- Discrimination Defined Regarding Housing Disability Accommodations. Government Code section Code, § 12927(c)(1).

- "Disability" Defined for Housing Discrimination. Government Code section 12955.3.

- "FEHA prohibits, as unlawful discrimination, a 'refusal to make reasonable accommodations in rules, policies, practices, or services when these accommodations may be necessary to afford a disabled person equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling.' 'In order to establish discrimination based on a refusal to provide reasonable accommodations, a party must establish that he or she (1) suffers from a disability as defined in FEHA, (2) the discriminating party knew of, or should have known of, the disability, (3) accommodation is necessary to afford an equal opportunity to use and enjoy the dwelling, and (4) the discriminating party refused to make this accommodation.' " (*Roman v. BRE Properties, Inc.* (2015) 237 Cal.App.4th 1040, 1051 [188 Cal.Rptr.3d 537], internal citation omitted.)

- "We note that, currently, section 12955.3 explicitly states that 'disability' includes 'any physical or mental disability as defined in Section 12926.' That statute in turn defines 'mental disability' to include "any mental or psychological disorder or condition … that limits a major life activity', that is, 'makes the achievement of the major life activity difficult.' 'Major life activities' is to be broadly construed, and includes 'physical, mental, and social activities and working.' " (*Auburn Woods I Homeowners Assn. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com.* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1578, 1592 [18 Cal.Rptr.3d 669], internal citations omitted.)

- "[T]he basic principles applicable in employment cases should also apply in the housing context." (*Brown v. Smith* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 767, 782 [64Cal.Rptr.2d 301].)

Secondary Sources

3020. Excessive Use of Force—Unreasonable Arrest or Other Seizure—Essential Factual Elements (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] used excessive force in [arresting/detaining] [him/her]. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] used force in [arresting/detaining] [***name of plaintiff***];**

2. **That the force used by [***name of defendant***] was excessive;**

3. **That [***name of defendant***] was acting or purporting to act in the performance of [his/her] official duties;**

4. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

5. **That [***name of defendant***]'s use of excessive force was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

Force is not excessive if it is reasonably necessary under the circumstances. In deciding whether force is reasonably necessary or excessive, you should determine, based on all of the facts and circumstances, what force a reasonable law enforcement officer on the scene would have used under the same or similar circumstances. You should consider the following:

(a) Whether [*name of plaintiff***] reasonably appeared to pose an immediate threat to the safety of [***name of defendant***] or others;**

(b) The seriousness of the crime at issue; [and]

(c) Whether [*name of plaintiff***] was actively [resisting [arrest/detention]/ [or] attempting to avoid [arrest/detention] by flight][./; and]**

(d) [*specify other factors particular to the case***].**

New September 2003; Revised June 2012; Renumbered from CACI No. 3001 December 2012; Revised June 2015, June 2016

Directions for Use

The "official duties" referred to in element 3 must be duties created by a state, county, or municipal law, ordinance, or regulation. This aspect of color of law most likely will not be an issue for the jury, so it has been omitted to shorten the wording of element 3.

The three factors (a), (b), and (c) listed are often referred to as the "*Graham* factors." (See *Graham v.*

Connor (1989) 490 U.S. 386, 396 [109 S.Ct. 1865, 104 L.Ed.2d 443].) The *Graham* factors are not exclusive. (See *Glenn v. Wash. County* (9th Cir. 2011) 661 F.3d 460, 467–468.) Additional factors may be added if appropriate to the facts of the case.

Additional considerations and verdict form questions will be needed if there is a question of fact as to whether the defendant law enforcement officer had time for reflective decision-making before applying force. If the officers' conduct required a reaction to fast-paced circumstances presenting competing public safety obligations, the plaintiff must prove intent to harm. (See *Green v. County of Riverside* (2015) 238 Cal.App.4th 1363, 1372 [190 Cal.Rptr.3d 693].)

No case has yet determined, and therefore it is unclear, whether the defense has either the burden of proof or the burden of producing evidence on reaction to fast-paced circumstances. (See Evid. Code, §§ 500 [party has burden of proof as to each fact the existence or nonexistence of which is essential to the claim for relief or defense asserted], 550 [burden of producing evidence as to particular fact is on party against whom a finding on the fact would be required in absence of further evidence].)

For an ~~This~~ instruction ~~may be modified~~ for use in a negligence claim under California common law based on the same event and facts, see CACI No. 440, *Unreasonable Force by Law Enforcement Officer in Arrest or Other Seizure—Essential Factual Elements*. For an instruction for use alleging excessive force as a battery, see CACI No. 1305, *Battery by Police Officer*. ~~The *Graham* factors apply under California negligence law. (*Hernandez v. City of Pomona* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 501, 514 [94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1, 207 P.3d 506].) Liability under California negligence law can arise if tactical conduct and decisions preceding the use of force, as part of the totality of circumstances, make the ultimate use of force unreasonable. In this respect, California negligence law differs from the federal standard under the Fourth Amendment, which focuses more narrowly on the moment when force is used. (*Hayes v. County of San Diego* (2014) 57 Cal.4th 622, 639 [160 Cal.Rptr.3d 684, 305 P.3d 252].) If the negligence claim is based in part on tactical conduct and decisions made before the use of force, this instruction may be modified to specifically instruct the jury to consider the officers' pre-force decisions and conduct.~~

Sources and Authority

- "In addressing an excessive force claim brought under § 1983, analysis begins by identifying the specific constitutional right allegedly infringed by the challenged application of force. In most instances, that will be either the Fourth Amendment's prohibition against unreasonable seizures of the person, or the Eighth Amendment's ban on cruel and unusual punishments, which are the two primary sources of constitutional protection against physically abusive governmental conduct." (*Graham, supra,* 490 U.S. at p. 395, internal citations and footnote omitted.)

- "Where, as here, the excessive force claim arises in the context of an arrest or investigatory stop of a free citizen, it is most properly characterized as one invoking the protections of the Fourth Amendment, which guarantees citizens the right 'to be secure in their persons ... against unreasonable ... seizures' of the person." (*Graham, supra,* 490 U.S. at p. 394.)

- "[A]ll claims that law enforcement officers have used excessive force-deadly or not-in the course of an arrest, investigatory stop, or other 'seizure' of a free citizen should be analyzed under the Fourth Amendment and its 'reasonableness' standard, rather than under a 'substantive due process'

approach." (*Graham, supra,* 490 U.S. at p. 395.)

- "The 'reasonableness' of a particular use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene, rather than with the 20/20 vision of hindsight." (*Graham, supra,* 490 U.S. at p. 396.)

- "Because '[t]he test of reasonableness under the Fourth Amendment is not capable of precise definition or mechanical application,' ... its proper application requires careful attention to the facts and circumstances of each particular case, including the severity of the crime at issue, whether the suspect poses an immediate threat to the safety of the officers or others, and whether he is actively resisting arrest or attempting to evade arrest by flight." (*Graham, supra,* 490 U.S. at p. 396, internal citation omitted.)

- "The most important of these [factors from *Graham,* above] is whether the suspect posed an immediate threat to the officers or others, as measured objectively under the circumstances." (*Mendoza v. City of West Covina* (2012) 206 Cal.App.4th 702, 712 [141 Cal.Rptr.3d 553] .)

- "[The *Graham*] factors, however, are not exclusive. We 'examine the totality of the circumstances and consider "whatever specific factors may be appropriate in a particular case, whether or not listed in *Graham*." ' Other relevant factors include the availability of less intrusive alternatives to the force employed, whether proper warnings were given and whether it should have been apparent to officers that the person they used force against was emotionally disturbed." (*Glenn, supra*, 661 F.3d at p. 467, internal citations omitted.)

- "Because the reasonableness standard 'nearly always requires a jury to sift through disputed factual contentions, and to draw inferences therefrom, we have held on many occasions that summary judgment or judgment as a matter of law in excessive force cases should be granted sparingly.' " (*Torres v. City of Madera* (9th Cir. 2011) 648 F.3d 1119, 1125.)

- "Justice Stevens incorrectly declares [the 'objective reasonableness' standard under *Graham*] to be 'a question of fact best reserved for a jury,' and complains we are 'usurp[ing] the jury's factfinding function.'. At the summary judgment stage, however, once we have determined the relevant set of facts and drawn all inferences in favor of the nonmoving party to the extent supportable by the record, the reasonableness of [defendant]'s actions--or, in Justice Stevens' parlance, '[w]hether [respondent's] actions have risen to a level warranting deadly force,' is a pure question of law." (*Scott v. Harris* (2007) 550 U.S. 372, 381, fn. 8 [127 S. Ct. 1769; 167 L. Ed. 2d 686], internal citations omitted.)

- "To be sure, the reasonableness inquiry in the context of excessive force balances 'intrusion[s] on the individual's Fourth Amendment interests' against the government's interests. But in weighing the evidence in favor of the officers, rather than the [plaintiffs], the district court unfairly tipped the reasonableness inquiry in the officers' favor." (*Sandoval v. Las Vegas Metro. Police Dep't* (9th Cir. 2014) 756 F.3d 1154, 1167, internal citation omitted.)

- "The Fourth Amendment's 'reasonableness' standard is not the same as the standard of 'reasonable care' under tort law, and negligent acts do not incur constitutional liability." (*Hayes, supra,* 57 Cal.4th at p. 639.)

- "[S]tate negligence law, which considers the totality of the circumstances surrounding any use of deadly force, is broader than federal Fourth Amendment law, which tends to focus more narrowly on the moment when deadly force is used." (*Hayes, supra,* 57 Cal.4th at p. 639, internal citations omitted.)

- "We are cognizant of the Supreme Court's command to evaluate an officer's actions 'from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene, rather than with the 20/20 vision of hindsight.' We also recognize the reality that 'police officers are often forced to make split-second judgments--in circumstances that are tense, uncertain, and rapidly evolving--about the amount of force that is necessary in a particular situation.' This does not mean, however, that a Fourth Amendment violation will be found only in those rare instances where an officer and his attorney are unable to find a sufficient number of compelling adjectives to describe the victim's conduct. Nor does it mean that we can base our analysis on what officers actually felt or believed during an incident. Rather, we must ask if the officers' conduct is ' "objectively reasonable" in light of the facts and circumstances confronting them' without regard for an officer's subjective intentions." (*Bryan v. MacPherson* (9th Cir. 2010) 630 F.3d 805, 831, internal citations omitted.)

- "[A]n officer may not use deadly force to apprehend a suspect where the suspect poses no immediate threat to the officer or others. On the other hand, it is not constitutionally unreasonable to prevent escape using deadly force '[w]here the officer has probable cause to believe that the suspect poses a threat of serious physical harm, either to the officer or to others.' " (*Wilkinson v. Torres* (9th Cir. 2010) 610 F.3d 546, 550, internal citations omitted.)

- "Resistance, or the reasonable perception of resistance, does not entitle police officers to use any amount of force to restrain a suspect. Rather, police officers who confront actual (or perceived) resistance are only permitted to use an amount of force that is reasonable to overcome that resistance." (*Barnard v. Theobald* (9th Cir. 2013) 721 F.3d 1069, 1076, internal citations omitted.)

- " In any event, the court correctly instructed the jury on the mental state required in a Fourteenth Amendment excessive use of force case under section 1983 because this case did not involve reflective decisionmaking by the officers, but instead their reaction to fast-paced circumstances presenting competing public safety obligations. Given these circumstances, [plaintiff] was required to prove that the officers acted with a purpose to cause harm to her son." (*Green v. County of Riverside* (2015) 238 Cal.App.4th 1363, 1372 [190 Cal.Rptr.3d 693].)

- "[T]he fact that the 'suspect was armed with a deadly weapon' does *not* render the officers' response per se reasonable under the Fourth Amendment. [¶] This is not to say that the Fourth Amendment always requires officers to delay their fire until a suspect turns his weapon on them. If the person is armed—or reasonably suspected of being armed—a furtive movement, harrowing gesture, or serious verbal threat might create an immediate threat." (*George v. Morris* (9th Cir. 2013) 724 F.3d 1191, 1200, original italics, internal citations omitted.)

- " '[A] simple statement by an officer that he fears for his safety or the safety of others is not enough; there must be objective factors to justify such a concern.' Here, whether objective factors supported [defendant]'s supposed subjective fear is not a question that can be answered as a matter of law based

upon the limited evidence in the record, especially given that on summary judgment that evidence must be construed in the light most favorable to [plaintiff], the non-moving party. Rather, whether [defendant]'s claim that he feared a broccoli-based assault is credible and reasonable presents a genuine question of material fact that must be resolved not by a court ruling on a motion for summary judgment but by a jury in its capacity as the trier of fact." (*Young v. County of Los Angeles* (9th Cir. 2011) 655 F.3d 1156, 1163–1164.)

- "Although *Graham* does not specifically identify as a relevant factor whether the suspect poses a threat to *himself*, we assume that the officers could have used some reasonable level of force to try to prevent [decedent] from taking a suicidal act. But we are aware of no published cases holding it reasonable to use a *significant* amount of force to try to stop someone from attempting suicide. Indeed, it would be odd to permit officers to use force capable of causing serious injury or death in an effort to prevent the possibility that an individual might attempt to harm only himself. We do not rule out that in some circumstances some force might be warranted to prevent suicide, but in cases like this one the 'solution' could be worse than the problem." (*Glenn, supra,* 661 F.3d at p. 468.)

- "[W]e have stated that if the police were summoned to the scene to protect a mentally ill offender from himself, the government has less interest in using force. By contrast, if the officer warned the offender that he would employ force, but the suspect refused to comply, the government has an increased interest in the use of force." (*Marquez v. City of Phoenix* (9th Cir. 2012) 693 F.3d 1167, 1175, internal citation omitted.)

- "[P]reshooting conduct is included in the totality of circumstances surrounding an officer's use of deadly force, and therefore the officer's duty to act reasonably when using deadly force extends to preshooting conduct. But in a case like this one, where the preshooting conduct did not cause the plaintiff any injury independent of the injury resulting from the shooting, the reasonableness of the officers' preshooting conduct should not be considered in isolation. Rather, it should be considered in relation to the question whether the officers' ultimate use of deadly force was reasonable." (*Hayes, supra,* 57 Cal.4th at p. 632, internal citation omitted.)

- "A person is seized by the police and thus entitled to challenge the government's action under the Fourth Amendment when the officer by means of physical force or show of authority terminates or restrains his freedom of movement through means intentionally applied." (*Nelson v. City of Davis* (9th Cir. 2012) 685 F.3d 867, 875.)

- "The Supreme Court has interpreted the phrase 'under "color" of law' to mean 'under "pretense" of law.' A police officer's actions are under pretense of law only if they are 'in some way "related to the performance of his official duties." ' By contrast, an officer who is ' "pursuing his own goals and is not in any way subject to control by [his public employer]," ' does not act under color of law, unless he 'purports or pretends' to do so. Officers who engage in confrontations for personal reasons unrelated to law enforcement, and do not 'purport[] or pretend[]' to be officers, do not act under color of law." (*Huffman v. County of Los Angeles* (9th Cir. 1998) 147 F.3d 1054, 1058, internal citations omitted.)

- "We hold that, in order to recover damages for allegedly unconstitutional conviction or imprisonment, or for other harm caused by actions whose unlawfulness would render a conviction or sentence

invalid, a § 1983 plaintiff must prove that the conviction or sentence has been reversed on direct appeal, expunged by executive order, declared invalid by a state tribunal authorized to make such determination, or called into question by a federal court's issuance of a writ of habeas corpus. A claim for damages bearing that relationship to a conviction or sentence that has not been so invalidated is not cognizable under § 1983. Thus, when a state prisoner seeks damages in a § 1983 suit, the district court must consider whether a judgment in favor of the plaintiff would necessarily imply the invalidity of his conviction or sentence; if it would, the complaint must be dismissed unless the plaintiff can demonstrate that the conviction or sentence has already been invalidated. But if the district court determines that the plaintiff's action, even if successful, will not demonstrate the invalidity of any outstanding criminal judgment against the plaintiff, the action should be allowed to proceed, in the absence of some other bar to the suit." (*Heck v. Humphrey* (1994) 512 U.S. 477, 486–487 [114 S.Ct. 2364, 129 L.Ed.2d 383], footnotes and internal citation omitted.)

- "[Plaintiff]'s section 1983 claim *is* barred to the extent it alleges that [the arresting officer] lacked justification to arrest him or to respond with reasonable force to his resistance. The use of deadly force in this situation, though, requires a separate analysis. 'For example, a defendant might resist a lawful arrest, to which the arresting officers might respond with excessive force to subdue him. The subsequent use of excessive force would not negate the lawfulness of the initial arrest attempt, or negate the unlawfulness of the criminal defendant's attempt to resist it. Though occurring in one continuous chain of events, two isolated factual contexts would exist, the first giving rise to criminal liability on the part of the criminal defendant, and the second giving rise to civil liability on the part of the arresting officer.' " (*Yount v. City of Sacramento* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 885, 899 [76 Cal.Rptr.3d 787, 183 P.3d 471], original italics.)

- "[T]he district court effectively required the jury to presume that the arrest *was* constitutionally lawful, and so not to consider facts concerning the basis for the arrest. Doing so removed critical factual questions that were within the jury's province to decide. For instance, by taking from the jury the question whether [officer]'s arrest of [plaintiff] for resisting or obstructing a police officer was lawful, the district judge implied simultaneously that [plaintiff] was in fact resisting or failing to obey the police officer's lawful instructions. Presuming such resistance could certainly have influenced the jury's assessment of 'the need for force,' as well as its consideration of the other *Graham* factors, including 'whether [the suspect] is actively resisting arrest or attempting to evade arrest by flight. By erroneously granting judgment as a matter of law on [plaintiff]'s unlawful arrest claim, the district court impermissibly truncated the jury's consideration of [plaintiff]'s excessive force claim." (*Velazquez v. City of Long Beach* (9th Cir. 2015) 793 F.3d 1010, --, original italics.)

- "[P]rivate parties ordinarily are not subject to suit under section 1983, unless, sifting the circumstances of the particular case, the state has so significantly involved itself in the private conduct that the private parties may fairly be termed state actors. Among the factors considered are whether the state subsidized or heavily regulated the conduct, or compelled or encouraged the particular conduct, whether the private actor was performing a function which normally is performed exclusively by the state, and whether there was a symbiotic relationship rendering the conduct joint state action." (*Robbins v. Hamburger Home for Girls* (1995) 32 Cal.App.4th 671, 683 [38 Cal.Rptr.2d 534], internal citations omitted.)

- "Private parties act under color of state law if they willfully participate in joint action with state

officials to deprive others of constitutional rights. Private parties involved in such a conspiracy may be liable under section 1983." (*United Steelworkers of America v. Phelps Dodge Corp.* (9th Cir.1989) 865 F.2d 1539, 1540, internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

8 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Constitutional Law, §§ 816, 819 et seq.

Chin et al., California Practice Guide: Employment Litigation, Ch.7-G, *Unruh Civil Rights Act*, ¶ 7:1526 et seq. (The Rutter Group)

3 Civil Rights Actions, Ch. 10, *Deprivation of Rights Under Color of State Law—Law Enforcement and Prosecution*, ¶¶ 10.00–10.03 (Matthew Bender)

11 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 113, *Civil Rights: The Post-Civil War Civil Rights Statutes*, § 113.14 (Matthew Bender)

3021. Unlawful Arrest by Peace Officer Without a Warrant—Essential Factual Elements (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] wrongfully arrested [him/her] because [he/she] did not have a warrant. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] arrested [***name of plaintiff***] without a warrant and without probable cause;**

2. **That [***name of defendant***] was acting or purporting to act in the performance of [his/her] official duties;**

3. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

4. **That [***name of defendant***]'s conduct was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

[The law requires that the trial judge, rather than the jury, decide if [*name of plaintiff***] was arrested without probable cause. But in order for me to do so, you must first decide:**

[*List all factual disputes that must be resolved by the jury.***]]**

New April 2009; Revised December 2009; Renumbered from CACI No. 3014 December 2012, June 2016

Directions for Use

Give this instruction in a false arrest case brought under title 42 United States Code section 1983. For an instruction for false arrest under California law, see CACI No. 1401, *Essential Factual Elements—False Arrest Without Warrant by Peace Officer*.

The ultimate determination of whether the arresting officer had probable cause (element 1) is to be made by the court as a matter of law. (*Hunter v. Bryant* (1991) 502 U.S. 224, 227−228 [112 S.Ct. 534; 116 L.Ed.2d 589].) However, in exercising this role, the court does not sit as the trier of fact. It is still the province of the jury to determine the facts on conflicting evidence as to what the arresting officer knew at the time. (See *Velazquez v. City of Long Beach* (9th Cir. 2015) 793 F.3d 1010, 1018−1023; see also (*King v. State of California* (2015) 242 Cal.App.4th 265, 289 [195 Cal.Rptr.3d 286].)

The "official duties" referred to in element 2 must be duties created by a state, county, or municipal law, ordinance, or regulation. This aspect of color of law most likely will not be an issue for the jury, so it has been omitted to shorten the wording of element 2.

Sources and Authority

- "The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution, made applicable to the states by the Fourteenth Amendment, provides: 'The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.' " (*Conway v. Pasadena Humane Society* (1996) 45 Cal.App.4th 163, 171 [52 Cal.Rptr.2d 777], internal citation omitted.)

- " 'A claim for unlawful arrest is cognizable under § 1983 as a violation of the Fourth Amendment, provided the arrest was without probable cause or other justification.'. 'Probable cause exists if the arresting officers "had knowledge and reasonably trustworthy information of facts and circumstances sufficient to lead a prudent person to believe that [the arrestee] had committed or was committing a crime." ' " (*Gravelet-Blondin v. Shelton* (9th Cir. 2013) 728 F.3d 1086, 1097−1098.)

- "The Court of Appeals' confusion is evident from its statement that 'whether a reasonable officer could have believed he had probable cause is a question for the trier of fact, and summary judgment . . . based on lack of probable cause is proper only if there is only one reasonable conclusion a jury could reach.' This statement of law is wrong for two reasons. First, it routinely places the question of immunity in the hands of the jury. Immunity ordinarily should be decided by the court long before trial. Second, the court should ask whether the agents acted reasonably under settled law in the circumstances, not whether another reasonable, or more reasonable, interpretation of the events can be constructed five years after the fact." (*Hunter*, *supra*, 502 U.S. at pp. 227−228, internal citations omitted.)

- "The mere existence of some evidence that could suggest self-defense does not negate probable cause. [Plaintiff]'s claim of self-defense apparently created doubt in the minds of the jurors, but probable cause can well exist (and often does) even though ultimately, a jury is not persuaded that there is proof beyond a reasonable doubt." (*Yousefian v. City of Glendale* (9th Cir. 2015) 779 F.3d 1010, 1014.)

- "The Supreme Court has interpreted the phrase 'under "color" of law' to mean 'under "pretense" of law.' A police officer's actions are under pretense of law only if they are 'in some way "related to the performance of his official duties." ' By contrast, an officer who is ' "pursuing his own goals and is not in any way subject to control by [his public employer]," ' does not act under color of law, unless he 'purports or pretends' to do so. Officers who engage in confrontations for personal reasons unrelated to law enforcement, and do not 'purport[] or pretend[]' to be officers, do not act under color of law." (*Huffman v. County of Los Angeles* (9th Cir. 1998) 147 F.3d 1054, 1058, internal citations omitted.)

- "Although the plaintiff bears the burden of proof on the issue of unlawful arrest, she can make a prima facie case simply by showing that the arrest was conducted without a valid warrant. At that point, the burden shifts to the defendant to provide some evidence that the arresting officers had probable cause for a warrantless arrest. The plaintiff still has the ultimate burden of proof, but the burden of production falls on the defendant." (*Dubner v. City & County of San Francisco* (9th Cir. 2001) 266 F.3d 959, 965.)

- "There is no bright-line rule to establish whether an investigatory stop has risen to the level of an

arrest. Instead, this difference is ascertained in light of the ‘ “totality of the circumstances.” ’ This is a highly fact-specific inquiry that considers the intrusiveness of the methods used in light of whether these methods were ‘reasonable *given the specific circumstances*.’ ” (*Green v. City & County of San Francisco* (9th Cir. 2014) 751 F.3d 1039, 1047, original italics, internal citations omitted.)

- “Because stopping an automobile and detaining its occupants, ‘even if only for a brief period and for a limited purpose,’ constitutes a ‘seizure’ under the Fourth Amendment, an official must have individualized ‘reasonable suspicion’ of unlawful conduct to carry out such a stop.” (*Tarabochia v. Adkins* (9th Cir. 2014) 766 F.3d 1115, 1121, internal citation omitted.)

- “ ‘[Q]ualified immunity is a question of law, not a question of fact. [Citation.] But Defendants are only entitled to qualified immunity as a matter of law if, taking the facts in the light most favorable to [the plaintiff], they violated no clearly established constitutional right. The court must deny the motion for judgment as a matter of law if reasonable jurors could believe that Defendants violated [the plaintiff's] constitutional right, and the right at issue was clearly established.’ ‘The availability of qualified immunity after a trial is a legal question informed by the jury's findings of fact, but ultimately committed to the court's judgment.’ ‘‘ ‘[D]eference to the jury's view of the facts persists throughout each prong of the qualified immunity inquiry.’ ” ‘[T]he jury's view of the facts must govern our analysis once litigation has ended with a jury's verdict.’ ‘Where, as here, the legal question of qualified immunity turns upon which version of the facts one accepts, the jury, not the judge, must determine liability.’ ” (*King, supra,* 242 Cal.App.4th at p. 289, internal citations omitted.)

- “[I]f what the policeman knew prior to the arrest is genuinely in dispute, and if a reasonable officer's perception of probable cause would differ depending on the correct version, that factual dispute must be resolved by a fact finder. [Citations.] [¶] … [W]e do not find the facts relative to probable cause to arrest, and the alleged related conspiracy, so plain as to lead us to only a single conclusion, i.e., a conclusion in defendants' favor. The facts are complex, intricate and in key areas contested. Even more important, the inferences to be drawn from the web of facts are disputed and unclear—and are likely to depend on credibility judgments.” (*King, supra*, 242 Cal.App.4th at p. 291, internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, § 181

5 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 60, *Principles of Liability and Immunity of Public Entities and Employees*, § 60.06 (Matthew Bender)

11 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 113, *Civil Rights: The Post-Civil War Civil Rights Statutes*, § 113.14 (Matthew Bender)

2 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 21, *Assault and Battery*, § 21.36A (Matthew Bender)

1 Civil Rights Actions, Ch. 2, *Institutional and Individual Immunity*, § 2.03 (Matthew Bender)

3040. Violation of Prisoner's Federal Civil Rights—Eighth Amendment—Substantial Risk of Serious Harm (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] subjected [him/her] to prison conditions that violated [his/her] constitutional rights. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That while imprisoned, [***describe violation that created risk, e.g., [name of plaintiff] was placed in a cell block with rival gang members***];**

2. **That [***name of defendant***]'s conduct created a substantial risk of serious harm to [***name of plaintiff***]'s health or safety;**

3. **That [***name of defendant***] knew that [his/her] conduct created a substantial risk of serious harm to [***name of plaintiff***]'s health or safety, but disregarded the risk;**

4. **That there was no reasonable justification for the conduct;**

5. **That [***name of defendant***] was acting or purporting to act in the performance of [his/her] official duties;**

6. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

7. **That [***name of defendant***]'s conduct was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

Whether the risk was obvious is a factor that you may consider in determining whether [*name of defendant***] knew of the risk.**

New September 2003; Revised December 2010, June 2011; Renumbered from CACI No. 3011 December 2012; Revised December 2014, June 2015, June 2016

Directions for Use

Give this instruction in a case involving conduct that allegedly created a substantial risk of serious harm to an inmate. (See *Farmer v. Brennan* (1994) 511 U.S. 825 [114 S.Ct. 1970, 128 L.Ed.2d 811].) For an instruction on deprivation of medical care, see CACI No. 3041, *Violation of Prisoner's Federal Civil Rights—Eighth Amendment—Medical Care*. For an instruction involving the deprivation of necessities, see CACI No. 3043, *Violation of Prisoner's Federal Civil Rights—Eight Amendment—Deprivation of Necessities*.

In prison-conditions cases, the inmate must show that the defendant was deliberately indifferent to his or her health or safety. (*Farmer, supra*, 511 U.S. at p. 834.) "Deliberate indifference" involves a two part inquiry. First, the inmate must show that the prison officials were aware of a "substantial risk of serious

harm" to the inmate's health or safety, but failed to act to address the danger. (See *Castro v. Cnty. of Los Angeles* (9th Cir. 2015) 797 F.3d 654, 666.) Second, the inmate must show that the prison officials had no "reasonable" justification for the conduct, in spite of that risk. (*Thomas v. Ponder* (9th Cir. 2010) 611 F.3d 1144, 1150.) Elements 3 and 4 express the deliberate-indifference components.

The "official duties" referred to in element 5 must be duties created by any state, county, or municipal law, ordinance, or regulation. This aspect of color of law most likely will not be an issue for the jury, so it has been omitted to shorten the wording of element 5.

Sources and Authority

- Civil Action for Deprivation of Rights. Title 42 United States Code section 1983.
- "It is undisputed that the treatment a prisoner receives in prison and the conditions under which he is confined are subject to scrutiny under the Eighth Amendment." (*Helling v. McKinney* (1993) 509 U.S. 25, 31 [113 S.Ct. 2475, 125 L.Ed.2d 22].)
- "Our cases have held that a prison official violates the Eighth Amendment only when two requirements are met. First, the deprivation alleged must be, objectively, 'sufficiently serious.' For a claim ... based on a failure to prevent harm, the inmate must show that he is incarcerated under conditions posing a substantial risk of serious harm. The second requirement follows from the principle that 'only the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain implicates the Eighth Amendment.' To violate the Cruel and Unusual Punishments Clause, a prison official must have a 'sufficiently culpable state of mind.' In prison-conditions cases that state of mind is one of 'deliberate indifference' to inmate health or safety ... ." (*Farmer, supra*, 511 U.S. at p. 834, internal citations omitted.)
- "A defendant is deemed 'deliberately indifferent' to a substantial risk of serious harm when he knew of the risk but disregarded it by failing to take reasonable measures to address the danger." (*Castro, supra*, 797 F.3d at p. 666.)
- "Whether a prison official had the requisite knowledge of a substantial risk is a question of fact subject to demonstration in the usual ways, including inference from circumstantial evidence, and a factfinder may conclude that a prison official knew of a substantial risk from the very fact that the risk was obvious." (*Farmer, supra*, 511 U.S. at p. 842, internal citation omitted.)
- "When instructing juries in deliberate indifference cases with such issues of proof, courts should be careful to ensure that the requirement of subjective culpability is not lost. It is not enough merely to find that a reasonable person would have known, or that the defendant should have known, and juries should be instructed accordingly." (*Farmer, supra*, 511 U.S. at p. 843 fn. 8.)
- "We hold ... that a prison official cannot be found liable under the Eighth Amendment for denying an inmate humane conditions of confinement unless the official knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health or safety; the official must both be aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists, and he must also draw the inference." (*Farmer, supra*, 511 U.S. at p. 837.)

- "The precise role of legitimate penological interests is not entirely clear in the context of an Eighth Amendment challenge to conditions of confinement. The Supreme Court has written that the test of *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 78, 107 S. Ct. 2254, 96 L. Ed. 2d 64 (1987), which requires only a reasonable relationship to a legitimate penological interest to justify prison regulations, does not apply to Eighth Amendment claims. … The existence of a legitimate penological justification has, however, been used in considering whether adverse treatment is sufficiently gratuitous to constitute punishment for Eighth Amendment purposes." (*Grenning v. Miller-Stout* (9th Cir. 2014) 739 F.3d 1235, 1240.)

- "The Supreme Court has interpreted the phrase 'under "color" of law' to mean 'under "pretense" of law.' A police officer's actions are under pretense of law only if they are 'in some way "related to the performance of his official duties." ' By contrast, an officer who is ' "pursuing his own goals and is not in any way subject to control by [his public employer]," ' does not act under color of law, unless he 'purports or pretends' to do so. Officers who engage in confrontations for personal reasons unrelated to law enforcement, and do not 'purport[] or pretend[]' to be officers, do not act under color of law." (*Huffman v. County of Los Angeles* (9th Cir. 1998) 147 F.3d 1054, 1058, internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

8 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Constitutional Law, § 826

3 Civil Rights Actions, Ch. 11, *Deprivation of Rights Under Color of State Law—Prisons*, ¶¶ 11.02–11.03 (Matthew Bender)

11 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 114, *Civil Rights: Prisoners' Rights*, § 114.28 (Matthew Bender)

3051. Unlawful Removal of Child From Parental Custody Without a Warrant—Essential Factual Elements (42 U.S.C., § 1983)

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] wrongfully removed [his/her] child from [his/her] parental custody because [he/she] did not have a warrant. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] removed [***name of plaintiff***]'s child from [his/her] parental custody without a warrant;**

2. **That [***name of defendant***] was performing or purporting to perform [his/her] official duties;**

3. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

4. **That [***name of defendant***]'s conduct was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

New June 2016

Directions for Use

This instruction is a variation on CACI No. 3021, *Unlawful Arrest by Peace Officer Without a Warrant—Essential Factual Elements*, and CACI No. 3023, *Unreasonable Search—Search Without a Warrant—Essential Factual Elements*, in which the warrantless act is the removal of a child from parental custody rather than an arrest or search. This instruction asserts a parent's due process right to familial association under the 14th amendment. It may be modified to assert or include the child's right under the 4th Amendment to be free of a warrantless seizure. (See *Arce v. Childrens Hospital Los Angeles* (2012) 211 Cal.App.4th 1455, 1473−1474 [150 Cal.Rptr.3d 735].)

Warrantless removal is a constitutional violation unless the authorities possess information at the time of the seizure that establishes reasonable cause to believe that the child is in imminent danger of serious bodily injury and that the scope of the intrusion is reasonably necessary to avert that specific injury. (*Arce, supra,* 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 1473 [150 Cal.Rptr.3d 735].) The committee believes that the defendant bears the burden of proving imminent danger. (See Evid. Code, § 500 ["Except as otherwise provided by law, a party has the burden of proof as to each fact the existence or nonexistence of which is essential to the claim for relief or defense that he is asserting."]; cf. *Welsh v. Wisconsin* (1984) 466 U.S. 740, 750 [104 S.Ct. 2091, 80 L.Ed.2d 732] ["Before agents of the government may invade the sanctity of the home, the burden is on the government to demonstrate exigent circumstances that overcome the presumption of unreasonableness that attaches to all warrantless home entries."].) CACI No. 3026, *Affirmative Defense─Exigent Circumstances* (to a warrantless search), may be modified to respond to this claim.

If the removal of the child was without a warrant and without exigent circumstances, but later found to be

justified by the court, damages are limited to those caused by the procedural defect, not the removal. (See *Watson v. City of San Jose* (9th Cir. 2015) 800 F.3d 1135, 1139.)

Sources and Authority

- " ' "Parents and children have a well-elaborated constitutional right to live together without governmental interference.' [Citation.] 'The Fourteenth Amendment guarantees that parents will not be separated from their children without due process of law except in emergencies." This 'right to family association' requires '[g]overnment officials … to obtain prior judicial authorization before intruding on a parent's custody of her child unless they possess information at the time of the seizure that establishes "reasonable cause to believe that the child is in imminent danger of serious bodily injury and that the scope of the intrusion is reasonably necessary to avert that specific injury." [Citation.]' " (*Arce, supra,* 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 1473, internal citations omitted.)

- " 'The Fourth Amendment also protects children from removal from their homes [without prior judicial authorization] absent such a showing. [Citation.] Officials, including social workers, who remove a child from its home without a warrant must have reasonable cause to believe that the child is likely to experience serious bodily harm in the time that would be required to obtain a warrant.' Because 'the same legal standard applies in evaluating Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment claims for the removal of children," we may "analyze [the claims] together.' " (*Arce, supra,* 211 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1473−1474.)

- "While the constitutional source of the parent's and the child's rights differ, the tests under the Fourteenth Amendment and the Fourth Amendment for when a child may be seized without a warrant are the same. The Constitution requires an official separating a child from its parents to obtain a court order unless the official has reasonable cause to believe the child is in 'imminent danger of serious bodily injury.' Seizure of a child is reasonable also where the official obtains parental consent." (*Jones v. County of L.A.* (9th Cir. 2015) 802 F.3d 990, 1000, internal citations omitted.)

- "[W]hether an official had 'reasonable cause to believe exigent circumstances existed in a given situation … [is a] "question[] of fact to be determined by a jury." [Citation.]' " (*Arce, supra,* 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 1475.)

- "Importantly, 'social workers who remove a child from its home without a warrant must have reasonable cause to believe that the child is likely to experience serious bodily harm *in the time that would be required to obtain a warrant*.' " (*Kirkpatrick v. County of Washoe* (9th Cir. 2015) 792 F.3d 1184, original italics.)

- "[A] child is seized for purposes of the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments when a representative of the state takes action causing a child to be detained at a hospital as part of a child abuse investigation, such that a reasonable person in the same position as the child's parent would believe that she cannot take her child home." (*Jones, supra,* 802 F.3d at p. 1001.)

- "[A] jury is needed to determine what a reasonable parent in the [plaintiffs'] position would have

believed and whether [defendant]'s conduct amounted to a seizure. (*Jones, supra*, 802 F.3d at p. 1002.)

- "In sum, although we do not dispute that Shaken Baby Syndrome is a serious, life-threatening injury, we disagree with the County defendants' assertion that a child may be detained without prior judicial authorization based solely on the fact that he or she has suffered a serious injury. Rather, the case law demonstrates that the warrantless detention of a child is improper unless there is "specific, articulable evidence" that the child would be placed at imminent risk of serious harm absent an immediate interference with parental custodial rights." (*Arce, supra*, 211 Cal.App.4th at p. 1481.)

- "[I] n cases where 'a deprivation is justified but procedures are deficient, whatever distress a person feels may be attributable to the justified deprivation rather than to deficiencies in procedure.' In such cases, … a plaintiff must 'convince the trier of fact that he actually suffered distress because of the denial of procedural due process itself.' " (*Watson, supra*, 800 F.3d at p. 1139, internal citation omitted; see *Carey v. Piphus* (1978) 435 U.S. 247, 263 [98 S.Ct. 1042, 55 L.Ed.2d 252].)

Secondary Sources

3060. Unruh Civil Rights Act—Essential Factual Elements (Civ. Code, §§ 51, 52)

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] denied [him/her] full and equal [accommodations/advantages/facilities/privileges/services] because of [his/her] [sex/race/color/religion/ancestry/national origin/disability/medical condition/genetic information/marital status/sexual orientation/citizenship/primary language/immigration status/[***insert other actionable characteristic***]]. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] [denied/aided or incited a denial of/discriminated or made a distinction that denied] full and equal [accommodations/advantages/facilities/privileges/services] to [***name of plaintiff***];**

2. **[That a substantial motivating reason for** [*name of defendant*]**'s conduct was [its perception of] [***name of plaintiff***]'s [sex/race/color/religion/ancestry/national origin/ medical condition/genetic information/marital status/sexual orientation/ citizenship/primary language/immigration status/[***insert other actionable characteristic***]];]**

   [That the [sex/race/color/religion/ancestry/national origin/medical condition/genetic information/marital status/sexual orientation/ citizenship/primary language/immigration status/[*insert other actionable characteristic***]] of a person whom [***name of plaintiff***] was associated with was a substantial motivating reason for [***name of defendant***]'s conduct;]**

3. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

4. **That [***name of defendant***]'s conduct was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

New September 2003; Revised December 2011, June 2012; Renumbered from CACI No. 3020 December 2012; Revised June 2013, June 2016

Directions for Use

Select the bracketed option from element 2 that is most appropriate to the facts of the case.

Note that element 2 uses the term "substantial motivating reason" to express both intent and causation between the protected classification and the defendant's conduct. "Substantial motivating reason" has been held to be the appropriate standard under the Fair Employment and Housing Act to address the possibility of both discriminatory and nondiscriminatory motives. (See *Harris v. City of Santa Monica* (2013) 56 Cal.4th 203, 232 [152 Cal.Rptr.3d 392, 294 P.3d 49]; CACI No. 2507, *"Substantial Motivating Reason" Explained*.) Whether the FEHA standard applies under the Unruh Act has not been addressed by the courts.

With the exception of claims that are also violations of the Americans With Disabilites Act (ADA) (see *Munson v. Del Taco, Inc.* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 661, 665 [94 Cal.Rptr.3d 685, 208 P.3d 623]), intentional discrimination is required for violations of the Unruh Act. (See *Harris v. Capital Growth Investors XIV* (1991) 52 Cal.3d 1142, 1149 [278 Cal.Rptr. 614, 805 P.2d 873].) The intent requirement is encompassed within the motivating-reason element. For claims that are also violations of the ADA, do not give element 2.

Note that there are two causation elements. There must be a causal link between the discriminatory intent and the adverse action (see element 2), and there must be a causal link between the adverse action and the harm (see element 4).

For an instruction on damages under the Unruh Act, see CACI No. 3067, *Unruh Civil Rights Act—Damages*. Note that the jury may award a successful plaintiff up to three times actual damages but not less than $4,000 regardless of any actual damages. (Civ. Code, § 52(a).) In this regard, harm is presumed, and elements 3 and 4 may be considered as established if no actual damages are sought. (See *Koire v. Metro Car Wash* (1985) 40 Cal.3d 24, 33 [219 Cal.Rptr. 133, 707 P.2d 195] [Unruh Act violations are per se injurious]; Civ. Code, § 52(a) [provides for minimum statutory damages for every violation regardless of the plaintiff's actual damages]; see also Civ. Code, § 52(h) ["actual damages" means special and general damages].)

The judge may decide the issue of whether the defendant is a business establishment as a matter of law. (*Rotary Club of Duarte v. Bd. of Directors* (1986) 178 Cal.App.3d 1035, 1050 [224 Cal.Rptr. 213].) Special interrogatories may be needed if there are factual issues. This element has been omitted from the instruction because it is unlikely to go to a jury.

The Act is not limited to the categories expressly mentioned in the statute. Other forms of arbitrary discrimination by business establishments are prohibited. (*In re Cox* (1970) 3 Cal.3d 205, 216 [90 Cal.Rptr. 24, 474 P.2d 992].) Therefore, this instruction allows the user to "*insert other actionable characteristic*" throughout. Nevertheless, there are limitations on expansion beyond the statutory classifications. First, the claim must be based on a personal characteristic similar to those listed in the statute. Second, the court must consider whether the alleged discrimination was justified by a legitimate business reason. Third, the consequences of allowing the claim to proceed must be taken into account. (*Semler v. General Electric Capital Corp.* (2011) 196 Cal.App.4th 1380, 1392–1393 [127 Cal.Rptr.3d 794]; see *Harris, supra,* 52 Cal.3d at pp. 1159–1162.) However, these issues are most likely to be resolved by the court rather than the jury. (See *Harris, supra,* 52 Cal.3d at p. 1165.) Therefore, no elements are included to address what may be an "other actionable characteristic." If there are contested factual issues, additional instructions or special interrogatories may be necessary.

Sources and Authority

- Unruh Civil Rights Act. Civil Code section 51.
- Remedies Under Unruh Act. Civil Code section 52.
- "The Unruh Act was enacted to 'create and preserve a nondiscriminatory environment in California business establishments by "banishing" or "eradicating" arbitrary, invidious discrimination by such establishments.' " (*Flowers v. Prasad* (2015) 238 Cal.App.4th 930, 937 [190 Cal.Rptr.3d 33].)

- " 'The Legislature used the words "all" and "of every kind whatsoever" in referring to business establishments covered by the Unruh Act, and the inclusion of these words without any exception and without specification of particular kinds of enterprises, leaves no doubt that the term "business establishments" was used in the broadest sense reasonably possible. The word "business" embraces everything about which one can be employed, and it is often synonymous with "calling, occupation, or trade, engaged in for the purpose of making a livelihood or gain." The word "establishment," as broadly defined, includes not only a fixed location, such as the "place where one is permanently fixed for residence or business," but also a permanent "commercial force or organization" or "a permanent settled position, (as in life or business)." ' " (*O'Connor v. Village Green Owners Assn.* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 790, 795 [191 Cal.Rptr. 320, 662 P.2d 427], internal citations omitted.)

- Whether a defendant is a "business establishment" is decided as an issue of law. (*Rotary Club of Duarte, supra,* 178 Cal.App.3d at p. 1050.)

- "In addition to the particular forms of discrimination specifically outlawed by the Act (sex, race, color, etc.), courts have held the Act 'prohibit[s] discrimination based on several classifications which are not specifically enumerated in the statute.' These judicially recognized classifications include unconventional dress or physical appearance, families with children, homosexuality, and persons under 18." (*Hessians Motorcycle Club v. J.C. Flanagans* (2001) 86 Cal.App.4th 833, 836 [103 Cal.Rptr.2d 552], internal citations omitted.)

- "[T]he language and history of the Unruh Act indicate that the legislative object was to prohibit intentional discrimination in access to public accommodations. We have been directed to no authority, nor have we located any, that would justify extension of a disparate impact test, which has been developed and applied by the federal courts primarily in employment discrimination cases, to a general discrimination-in-public-accommodations statute like the Unruh Act. Although evidence of adverse impact on a particular group of persons may have probative value in public accommodations cases and should therefore be admitted in appropriate cases subject to the general rules of evidence, a plaintiff must nonetheless plead and prove a case of intentional discrimination to recover under the Act." (*Harris, supra,* 52 Cal.3d at p. 1149.)

- "On examining the language, statutory context, and history of section 51, subdivision (f), we conclude … [t]he Legislature's intent in adding subdivision (f) was to provide disabled Californians injured by violations of the ADA with the remedies provided by section 52. A plaintiff who establishes a violation of the ADA, therefore, need not prove intentional discrimination in order to obtain damages under section 52." (*Munson, supra,* 46 Cal.4th at p. 665.)

- "Civil Code section 51, subdivision (f) states: 'A violation of the right of any individual under the federal [ADA] shall also constitute a violation of this section.' The ADA provides in pertinent part: 'No individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who … operates a place of public accommodation.' The ADA defines discrimination as 'a failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that

making such modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations.' " (*Baughman v. Walt Disney World Co.* (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 1438, 1446 [159 Cal.Rptr.3d 825], internal citations omitted.)

- " 'Although the Unruh Act proscribes "any form of arbitrary discrimination", certain types of discrimination have been denominated "reasonable" and, therefore, not arbitrary.' Thus, for example, 'legitimate business interests may justify limitations on consumer access to public accommodations.' " (*Hankins v. El Torito Restaurants, Inc.* (1998) 63 Cal.App.4th 510, 520 [74 Cal.Rptr.2d 684], internal citations omitted.)

- "Unruh Act issues have often been decided as questions of law on demurrer or summary judgment when the policy or practice of a business establishment is valid on its face because it bears a reasonable relation to commercial objectives appropriate to an enterprise serving the public." (*Harris, supra,* 52 Cal.3d at p. 1165, internal citations omitted.)

- "It is thus manifested by section 51 that all persons are entitled to the full and equal privilege of associating with others in any business establishment. And section 52, liberally interpreted, makes clear that discrimination by such a business establishment against one's right of association on account of the associates' color, is violative of the Act. It follows ... that discrimination by a business establishment against persons on account of their association with others of the black race is actionable under the Act." (*Winchell v. English* (1976) 62 Cal.App.3d 125, 129 [133 Cal.Rptr. 20].)

- "Appellant is disabled as a matter of law not only because she is HIV positive, but also because it is undisputed that respondent 'regarded or treated' her as a person with a disability. The protection of the Unruh Civil Rights Act extends both to people who are currently living with a physical disability that limits a life activity and to those who are regarded by others as living with such a disability. … 'Both the policy and language of the statute offer protection to a person who is not actually disabled, but is wrongly perceived to be. The statute's plain language leads to the conclusion that the "regarded as" definition casts a broader net and protects *any* individual "regarded" or "treated" by an employer "as having, or having had, any physical condition that makes achievement of a major life activity difficult" or may do so in the future.' Thus, even an HIV-positive person who is outwardly asymptomatic is protected by the Unruh Civil Rights Act." (*Maureen K. v. Tuschka* (2013) 215 Cal.App.4th 519, 529−530 [155 Cal.Rptr.3d 620], original italics, internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

8 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Constitutional Law, §§ 898–914

Chin et al., California Practice Guide: Employment Litigation, Ch.7-G, *Unruh Civil Rights Act*, ¶ 7:1525 et seq. (The Rutter Group)

11 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 116, *Civil Rights: Discrimination in Business Establishments*, §§ 116.10-116.13 (Matthew Bender)

3 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 35, *Civil Rights: Unruh Civil Rights Act*, § 35.20 et seq. (Matthew Bender)

3710. Ratification

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] is responsible for the harm caused by [***name of agent***]'s conduct because [***name of defendant*~~he/she/it~~**] approved that conduct after it occurred. If you find that [***name of agent***] harmed [***name of plaintiff***], you must decide whether [***name of defendant***] approved that conduct. To establish [his/her] claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of agent***], although not authorized to do so, purported ~~intended~~ to act on behalf of [***name of defendant***];**

2. **That [***name of defendant***] learned of [***name of agent***]'s conduct after it occurred;**

3. **That [***name of defendant***] learned all of the material facts involved in [***name of agent***]'s unauthorized conduct; and**

~~3~~4. **That [***name of defendant***] then approved [***name of agent***]'s conduct.**

Approval can be shown through words, or it can be inferred from a person's conduct. [Approval can be inferred if [*name of defendant***]~~a person~~ voluntarily keeps the benefits of [***name of agent*~~his/her/its~~]'s ~~[representative/employee]'s~~ unauthorized conduct after [he/she/it] learns of it~~the unauthorized conduct~~.]**

New September 2003; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

This instruction is for use in a traditional principal-agent relationship. The last bracketed sentence should be read only if it is appropriate to the facts of the case.

This instruction should not be given without modifications in an employment law case, in which an employee seeks to hold the employer liable for the tortious conduct of a supervisor or other employee. Ratification involves different considerations in employment law. For example, element 1 should not be given because it is not necessary for the culpable employee to purport to act on behalf of the employer. (See *Ventura v. ABM Industries Inc.* (2012) 212 Cal.App.4th 258, 271−272 [150 Cal.Rptr.3d 861] [CACI 3710 given without element 1].)

For an instruction for use for governmental entity liability in a civil rights case under Title 42 United States Code section 1983, see CACI No. 3004, *Local Government Liability—Act or Ratification by Official With Final Policymaking Authority—Essential Factual Elements*.

Sources and Authority

- Agency Created by Ratification. Civil Code section 2307.

- Ratification by Acceptance of Benefits. Civil Code section 2310.
- Partial Ratification. Civil Code section 2311.
- Vicarious Liability for Ratified Acts. Civil Code section 2339.

- "Ratification is the subsequent adoption by one person of an act which another without authority assumed to do as his agent." (*Anderson v. Fay Improv. Co.* (1955) 134 Cal.App.2d 738, 748 [286 P.2d 513].)

- " '[S]ince ratification contemplates an act by one person in behalf of another, there must exist at the time the unauthorized act was done a relationship, either actual or assumed, of principal and agent, between the person alleged to have ratified and the person by whom the unauthorized act was done.' " (*Anderson, supra*, 134 Cal.App.2d at p. 748, citing 2 California Jurisprudence 2d 741, section 83.)
-
- " 'Furthermore, the prevailing view is that there can be no ratification if the person who performed the unauthorized act did not at the time profess to be an agent.' " (*Anderson, supra*, 134 Cal.App.2d at p. 748, citing 2 California Jurisprudence 2d 741, section 83:)~~The concept of ratification is more commonly associated with contract law than tort law. Nevertheless, "[r]atification has, in fact, been a basis for imputed tort liability under the common law for centuries." (Kraus, *Ratification of Torts: An Overview and Critique of the Traditional Doctrine and Its Recent Extension to Claims of Workplace Harassment* (1997) 32 Tort & Ins. L.J. 807~~.)

- "Ratification is the voluntary election by a person to adopt in some manner as his own an act which was purportedly done on his behalf by another person, the effect of which, as to some or all persons, is to treat the act as if originally authorized by him. A purported agent's act may be adopted expressly or it may be adopted by implication based on conduct of the purported principal from which an intention to consent to or adopt the act may be fairly inferred, including conduct which is 'inconsistent with any reasonable intention on his part, other than that he intended approving and adopting it.' " (*Rakestraw v. Rodrigues* (1972) 8 Cal.3d 67, 73 [104 Cal.Rptr. 57, 500 P.2d 1401].)

- "Ratification is essentially a matter of assent. Consequently, a principal is not bound by ratification unless he acts with knowledge of all the material facts involved in the unauthorized transaction, particularly with knowledge of the acts of the person who assumed to act as his agent. This knowledge is equally necessary whether the ratification be express or implied." (*Bate v. Marsteller* (1959) 175 Cal.App.2d 573, 582 [346 P.2d 903].)

- "Ratification is the subsequent adoption by one claiming the benefits of an act, which without authority, another has voluntarily done while ostensibly acting as the agent of him who affirms the act and who had the power to confer authority. A principal cannot split an agency transaction and accept the benefits thereof without the burdens." (*Reusche v. California Pacific Title Ins. Co.* (1965) 231 Cal.App.2d 731, 737 [42 Cal.Rptr. 262], internal citation omitted.)

- "[A]n employer may be liable for an employee's act where the employer … subsequently ratified an originally unauthorized tort. [Citations.] The failure to discharge an employee who has committed

misconduct may be evidence of ratification. [Citation.] The theory of ratification is generally applied where an employer fails to investigate or respond to charges that an employee committed an intentional tort, such as assault or battery. [Citations.] Whether an employer has ratified an employee's conduct is generally a factual question. [Citation.]" (*Ventura, supra, ~~v. ABM Industries Inc.~~ (2012)* 212 Cal.App.4th at p.~~258,~~ 272~~ [150 Cal.Rptr.3d 861]~~.)

- "On this issue, the jury was instructed that in order to establish her claim that defendants were responsible for [supervisor]'s conduct, [plaintiff] 'must prove … that [defendants] learned of [supervisor]'s conduct after it occurred,' and that 'defendants approved [supervisor]'s conduct.' The instruction concluded, 'Approval can be shown through words, or it can be inferred from a person's conduct.' " [¶] Defendants contend that the instruction was erroneous because it did not tell the jury that there is ratification only if the employee intended to act on behalf of the employer, the employer actually knows that the wrongful conduct occurred, and the employer benefitted from the conduct, and that a disputed allegation is not actual knowledge. …We can see no error." (*Ventura, supra*, 212 Cal.App.4th at pp. 271−272.)

Secondary Sources

3 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Agency and Employment, §§ 139–143

1 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 8, *Vicarious Liability*, § 8.04[7] (Matthew Bender)

2 California Employment Law, Ch. 30, *Employers' Tort Liability to Third Parties for Conduct of Employees*, §§ 30.02, 30.07 (Matthew Bender)

21 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 248, *Employer's Liability for Employee's Torts*, § 248.13 (Matthew Bender)

37 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent*, § 427.18 (Matthew Bender)

10 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 100A, *Employer and Employee: Respondeat Superior*, § 100A.21 et seq. (Matthew Bender)

1 California Civil Practice: Torts § 3:4 (Thomson Reuters)

3923. Public Entities—Collateral Source Payments (Gov. Code, § 985)

You ~~shall~~ must award damages in an amount that fully compensates [*name of plaintiff*] for [his/her/its] damages in accordance with instructions from the court. You ~~shall~~ may not speculate or consider any other possible sources of benefit ~~the~~ that [*name of plaintiff*] may have received. After you have returned your verdict the court will make whatever adjustments are necessary in this regard.

New September 2003; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

Per Government Code section 985(j), this language is mandatory.

Sources and Authority

- Collateral Source Evidence Inadmissible in Action Against Public Entity. Government Code section 985(b).
- Mandatory Instruction. Government Code section 985(j).
- "[T]he [collateral source rule] also covers payments such as pensions paid to a plaintiff who, as a result of his injuries, can no longer work. Like insurance benefits, such payments are considered to have been secured by the plaintiff's efforts as part of his employment contract, and the tortfeasor is entitled to no credit for them. 'With respect to pension benefits, the justification for the rule is that the plaintiff secured the benefits by his labors, and the fact that he may obtain a double recovery is not relevant.' Pension benefits are a commonly cited example of a collateral source that may not be used to decrease a plaintiff's recovery." (*Mize-Kurzman v. Marin Community College Dist.* (2012) 202 Cal.App.4th 832, 872−873 [136 Cal.Rptr.3d 259], internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

6 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, § 1637

California Tort Damages (Cont.Ed.Bar) Restrictions on Recovery, § 15.21

15 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 177, *Damages*, § 177.50 (Matthew Bender)

6 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 64, *Damages: Torts*, § 64.190 et seq. (Matthew Bender)

2 California Civil Practice: Torts, § 31:47 (Thomson Reuters)

4000. Conservatorship—Essential Factual Elements

[*Name of petitioner***] claims that [***name of respondent***] is gravely disabled due to [a mental disorder/impairment by chronic alcoholism] and therefore should be placed in a conservatorship. In a conservatorship, a conservator is appointed to oversee, under the direction of the court, the care of persons who are gravely disabled due to a mental disorder or chronic alcoholism. To succeed on this claim, [***name of petitioner***] must prove beyond a reasonable doubt all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of respondent***] [has a mental disorder/is impaired by chronic alcoholism]; [and]**

2. **That [***name of respondent***] is gravely disabled as a result of the [mental disorder/chronic alcoholism][; and/.]**

[3. **That [***name of respondent***] is unwilling or unable voluntarily to accept meaningful treatment.]**

New June 2005; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

~~Element 3 may not be necessary in every case~~ There is a split of authority as to whether element 3 is required. (Compare~~see~~ *Conservatorship of Symington* (1989) 209 Cal.App.3d 1464, 1467 [257 Cal.Rptr. 860] ["[M]any gravely disabled individuals are simply beyond treatment."] with (*Conservatorship of Davis* (1981) 124 Cal.App.3d 313, 328 [177 Cal.Rptr. 369] [jury should be allowed to consider all factors that bear on whether person should be on LPS conservatorship, including willingness to accept treatment].)~~.~~

Sources and Authority

- Right to Jury Trial. Welfare and Institutions Code section 5350(d).
- "Gravely Disabled" Defined. Welfare and Institutions Code section 5008(h).
- "The Lanterman-Petris-Short Act (the act) governs the involuntary treatment of the mentally ill in California. Enacted by the Legislature in 1967, the act includes among its goals ending the inappropriate and indefinite commitment of the mentally ill, providing prompt evaluation and treatment of persons with serious mental disorders, guaranteeing and protecting public safety, safeguarding the rights of the involuntarily committed through judicial review, and providing individualized treatment, supervision and placement services for the gravely disabled by means of a conservatorship program." (*Conservatorship of Susan T.* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 1005, 1008–1009 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 40, 884 P.2d 988].)

- "The right to a jury trial upon the establishment of conservatorship is fundamental to the protections afforded by the LPS. As related, that right is expressly extended to the reestablishment of an LPS conservatorship." (*Conservatorship of Benvenuto* (1986) 180 Cal.App.3d 1030, 1037 [226 Cal.Rptr. 33], internal citations omitted.)

- "[T]he trial court erred in accepting counsel's waiver of [conservatee]'s right to a jury trial … . (*Estate of Kevin A.* (2015) 240 Cal.App.4th 1241, 1253 [193 Cal.Rptr.3d 237].)

- "Noting that a finding of grave disability may result in serious deprivation of personal liberty, the [Supreme Court] held that the due process clause of the California Constitution requires that proof beyond a reasonable doubt and jury unanimity be applied to conservatorship proceedings under the LPS Act." (*Conservatorship of Benvenuto*, *supra,* 180 Cal.App.3d at p. 1038, internal citations omitted.)

- "We ... hold that a person sought to be made an LPS conservatee subject to involuntary confinement in a mental institution, is entitled to have a unanimous jury determination of all of the questions involved in the imposition of such a conservatorship, and not just on the issue of grave disability in the narrow sense of whether he or she can safely survive in freedom and provide food, clothing or shelter unaided by willing, responsible relatives, friends or appropriate third persons." (*Conservatorship of Davis*, *supra*, ~~(1981)~~ 124 Cal.App.3d at p.~~313,~~ 328 ~~[177 Cal.Rptr. 369]~~.)

- "The jury should determine if the person voluntarily accepts meaningful treatment, in which case no conservatorship is necessary. If the jury finds the person will not accept treatment, then it must determine if the person can meet his basic needs on his own or with help, in which case a conservatorship is not justified." (*Conservatorship of Walker* (1987) 196 Cal.App.3d 1082, 1092–1093 [242 Cal.Rptr. 289].)

- "Our research has failed to reveal any authority for the proposition [that] without a finding that the proposed conservatee is unable or unwilling to voluntarily accept treatment, the court must reject a conservatorship in the face of grave disability. ... Some persons with grave disabilities are beyond treatment. Taken to its logical conclusion, they would be beyond the LPS Act's reach, according to the argument presented in this appeal." (*Conservatorship of Symington*, *supra,* 209 Cal.App.3d at p. 1469.)

- "The party seeking imposition of the conservatorship must prove the proposed conservatee's grave disability beyond a reasonable doubt and the verdict must be issued by a unanimous jury." (*Conservatorship of Susan T.*, *supra,* 8 Cal.4th at p. 1009, internal citation omitted.)

Secondary Sources

14 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Wills and Probate, § 945

3 Witkin, California Procedure (5th ed. 2008) Actions, § 97

2 California Conservatorship Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar) Ch. 23

32 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 361A, *Mental Health and Mental Disabilities: Judicial Commitment, Health Services, and Civil Rights*, § 361A.30 et seq. (Matthew Bender)

4005. Obligation to Prove—Reasonable Doubt

[*Name of respondent*] is presumed not to be gravely disabled. [*Name of petitioner*] has the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that [*name of respondent*] is gravely disabled. The fact that a petition has been filed claiming [*name of respondent*] is gravely disabled is not evidence that this claim is true.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you with an abiding conviction that [*name of respondent*] is gravely disabled as a result of [a mental disorder/impairment by chronic alcoholism]. The evidence need not eliminate all possible doubt because everything in life is open to some possible or imaginary doubt.

In deciding whether [*name of respondent*] is gravely disabled, you must impartially compare and consider all the evidence that was received throughout the entire trial.

Unless the evidence proves that [*name of respondent*] is gravely disabled because of [a mental disorder/impairment by chronic alcoholism] beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find that [he/she] is not gravely disabled.

Although a conservatorship is a civil proceeding, the burden of proof is the same as in criminal trials.

New June 2005; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

The presumption in the first sentence of the instruction is perhaps open to question. Two older cases have held that there is such a presumption. (See *Conservatorship of Law* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 1336, 1340 [249 Cal.Rptr. 415]; *Conservatorship of Walker* (1987) 196 Cal.App.3d 1082, 1099 [242 Cal.Rptr. 289].) However, these holdings may have been based on the assumption that the California Supreme Court had incorporated all protections for criminal defendants into LPS proceedings. (See *Conservatorship of Roulet* (1979) 23 Cal.3d 219, 235 [152 Cal.Rptr. 425, 590 P.2d 1] [proof beyond reasonable doubt and unanimous jury verdict required].) Subsequent cases have made it clear that an LPS respondent is not entitled to all of the same protections as a criminal defendant. (See *Conservatorship of Ben C.* (2007) 40 Cal.4th 529, 538 [53 Cal.Rptr.3d 856, 150 P.3d 738] [exclusionary rule and *Wende* review do not apply in LPS].)

Sources and Authority

- ~~"The due process clause of the California Constitution requires that proof beyond a reasonable doubt and a unanimous jury verdict be applied to conservatorship proceedings under the LPS Act." (*Conservatorship of Roulet* (1979) 23 Cal.3d 219, 235 [152 Cal.Rptr. 425, 590 P.2d 1].)~~

- "A proposed conservatee has a constitutional right to a finding based on proof beyond a reasonable

doubt. Without deciding whether the court has a sua sponte duty to so instruct, we are satisfied that, on request, a court is required to instruct in language emphasizing a proposed conservatee is presumed to not be gravely disabled until the state carries its burden of proof." (*Conservatorship of Walker*, *supra*, ~~(1987)~~ 196 Cal.App.3d at p.~~1082,~~ 1099 ~~[242 Cal.Rptr. 289]~~, internal citation omitted.)

- "[I]f requested, a court is required to instruct that a proposed conservatee is presumed not to be gravely disabled until the state carries its burden of proof." (*Conservatorship of Law*, *supra*, ~~(1988)~~ 202 Cal.App.3d at p.~~1336,~~ 1340 ~~[249 Cal.Rptr. 415]~~.)

- But see *People v. Beeson* (2002) 99 Cal.App.4th 1393, 1409 [122 Cal.Rptr.2d 384]: "Even if we view the presumption in a more general sense as a warning against the consideration of extraneous factors, we cannot conclude that the federal and state Constitutions require a presumption-of-innocence-like instruction outside the context of a criminal case. Particularly, we conclude that, based on the civil and nonpunitive nature of involuntary commitment proceedings, a mentally ill or disordered person would not be deprived of a fair trial without such an instruction."

- "Neither mental disorder nor grave disability is a crime." (*Conservatorship of Davis* (1981) 124 Cal.App.3d 313, 330 [177 Cal.Rptr. 369].)

- "More recently this court has recognized, however, that the analogy between criminal proceedings and proceedings under the LPS Act is imperfect at best and that not all of the safeguards required in the former are appropriate to the latter." (See *Conservatorship of Ben C. supra*, 40 Cal.4th at p. 538.)

- "In *Roulet*, the California Supreme Court held that due process requires proof beyond a reasonable doubt and jury unanimity in conservatorship proceedings. However, subsequent appellate court decisions have not extended the application of criminal law concepts in this area." (*Conservatorship of Maldonado* (1985) 173 Cal.App.3d 144, 147 [218 Cal.Rptr. 796].)

Secondary Sources

3 Witkin, California Procedure (5th ed. 2008) Actions, §§ 97, 104

2 California Conservatorship Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar) § 23.81

32 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 361A, *Mental Health and Mental Disabilities: Judicial Commitment, Health Services, and Civil Rights*, § 361A.33 (Matthew Bender)

4013. ~~Affidavit of Voter Registration~~Disqualification From Voting

If you find that [*name of respondent***], as a result of [a mental disorder/impairment by chronic alcoholism], is gravely disabled, then you must also decide whether [he/she] ~~is capable of completing an affidavit of voter registration~~should also be disqualified from voting. To ~~reach a verdict~~disqualify [***name of respondent***] from voting, all 12 jurors must find, by clear and convincing evidence, that [he/she~~*~~name of respondent~~*~~]~~ cannot communicate, with or without reasonable accommodations, a desire to participate in the voting process~~is not capable of completing an affidavit of voter registration, all 12 jurors must agree to that decision~~.**

~~**To complete an affidavit of voter registration, [***name of respondent***] must be able to state: the facts necessary to establish the [***name of respondent***] as a voter; [his/her] full name, residential address, and telephone number; [his/her] mailing address, if different from the residential address; [his/her] date of birth; the state or county of birth; [his/her] occupation; [his/her] political party affiliation; that [he/she] is not currently imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony; and whether [he/she] has been registered at another address, under another name, or is intending to affiliate with another party, and if so the prior address, name, or party.**~~

New June 2005; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

This instruction should be given if the petition prays for this relief.

In addition to the required jury finding, one of the following must apply (See Elec. Code, § 2208(a)):

(1) A conservator for the person or the person and estate is appointed under Division 4 (commencing with Section 1400) of the Probate Code;

(2) A conservator for the person or the person and estate is appointed under Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 5350) of Part 1 of Division 5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

(3) A conservator is appointed for the person under proceedings initiated under Section 5352.5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, the person has been found not competent to stand trial, and the person's trial or judgment has been suspended pursuant to Section 1370 of the Penal Code.

(4) A person has pleaded not guilty by reason of insanity, has been found to be not guilty under Section 1026 of the Penal Code, and is deemed to be gravely disabled at the time of judgment as defined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (h) of Section 5008 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

The court should determine if one of the above requirements has been met.

Sources and Authority

- ~~Jury Finding on Completion of Affidavit of Voter Registration~~Disqualification from Voting. Elections Code section 2208~~(b)~~.

- Affidavit of Voter Registration. Elections Code section 2150.

Secondary Sources

2 California Conservatorship Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar) § 11.34

32 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 361A, *Mental Health and Mental Disabilities: Judicial Commitment, Health Services, and Civil Rights*, § 361A.42 (Matthew Bender)

4200. Actual Intent to Hinder, Delay, or Defraud a Creditor—Essential Factual Elements (Civ. Code, § 3439.04(a)(1))

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims [he/she/it] was harmed because [***name of debtor***] ~~fraudulently~~ [transferred property/incurred an obligation] to [***name of defendant***] in order to avoid paying a debt to [***name of plaintiff***]. [This is called "actual fraud."] To establish this claim against [***name of defendant***], [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***] has a right to payment from [***name of debtor***] for [***insert amount of claim***];**

2. **That [***name of debtor***] [transferred property/incurred an obligation] to [***name of defendant***];**

3. **That [***name of debtor***] [transferred the property/incurred the obligation] with the intent to hinder, delay, or defraud one or more of [his/her/its] creditors;**

4. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

5. **That [***name of debtor***]'s conduct was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

To prove intent to hinder, delay, or defraud creditors, it is not necessary to show that [*name of debtor***] had a desire to harm [his/her/its] creditors. [***Name of plaintiff***] need only show that [***name of debtor***] intended to remove or conceal assets to make it more difficult for [his/her/its] creditors to collect payment.**

[It does not matter whether [*name of plaintiff***]'s right to payment arose before or after [***name of debtor***] [transferred property/incurred an obligation].]**

New June 2006; Revised June 2013, June 2016

Directions for Use

Under the Uniform Voidable Transactions Act (formerly the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act), a transfer made or obligation incurred by a debtor is voidable as to a creditor, whether the creditor's claim arose before or after the transfer was made or the obligation was incurred, if the debtor made the transfer or incurred the obligation with actual intent to hinder, delay, or defraud a creditor. (Civ. Code, § 3439.04(a)(1).)

This instruction assumes the defendant is a transferee of the original debtor. Read the bracketed second sentence ~~in cases in which~~if the plaintiff is asserting ~~causes of action~~claims for both actual and constructive fraud. Read the last bracketed sentence ~~in cases in which~~if the plaintiff's alleged claim arose after the defendant's property was transferred or the obligation was incurred.

Note that in element 3, only the debtor-transferor's ~~fraudulent~~ intent is required. (See Civ. Code, §

3439.04(a)(1).) The intent of the transferee is irrelevant. However, a transferee who receives the property both in good faith and for a reasonably equivalent value has an affirmative defense. (See Civ. Code, § 3439.08(a); CACI No. 4207, *Affirmative Defense—Good Faith*.)

If the case concerns an ~~fraudulently~~ incurred obligation, users may wish to insert a brief description of the obligation in this instruction, e.g., "a lien on the property."

Courts have held that there is a right to a jury trial whenever the remedy sought is monetary relief, including even the return of a "determinate sum of money." (*Wisden v. Superior Court* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 750, 757 [21 Cal.Rptr.3d 523], internal citation omitted.) If the only remedy sought is the return of a particular nonmonetary asset, the action is an equitable action. However, even ~~where~~ if a specific nonmonetary asset is involved, a conspiracy claim or an action against any party other than the transferee who possesses the asset (e.g., "the person for whose benefit the transfer was made" (Civ. Code, § 3439.08(b)(1)(A)) necessarily would seek monetary relief and give rise to a right to a jury trial.

Note that there may be a split of authority regarding the appropriate standard of proof of ~~fraudulent~~ intent. The Sixth District Court of Appeal has stated: "Actual intent to defraud must be shown by clear and convincing evidence. (*Hansford v. Lassar* (1975) 53 Cal.App.3d 364, 377 [125 Cal.Rptr. 804].)" (*Reddy v. Gonzalez* (1992) 8 Cal.App.4th 118, 123 [10 Cal.Rptr.2d 58].) Note that the case relied on by the *Hansford* court (*Aggregates Assoc., Inc. v. Packwood* (1962) 58 Cal.2d 580 [25 Cal.Rptr. 545, 375 P.2d 425]) was disapproved by the Supreme Court in *Liodas v. Sahadi* (1977) 19 Cal.3d 278, 291–292 [137 Cal.Rptr. 635, 562 P.2d 316]. The Fourth District Court of Appeal, Division Two, disagreed with *Reddy*: "In determining whether transfers occurred with fraudulent intent, we apply the preponderance of the evidence test, even though we recognize that some courts believe that the test requires clear and convincing evidence." (*Gagan v. Gouyd* (1999) 73 Cal.App.4th 835, 839 [86 Cal.Rptr.2d 733], internal citations omitted, disapproved on other grounds in *Mejia v. Reed* (2003) 31 Cal.4th 657, 669, fn. 2 [3 Cal.Rptr.3d 390, 74 P.3d 166].)

Sources and Authority

- Uniform ~~Fraudulent Transfer~~Voidable Transactions Act. Civil Code section 3439~~.04~~ et seq.
- "Claim" Defined for ~~UFTA~~UVTA. Civil Code section 3439.01(b).
- Creditor Remedies Under ~~UFTA~~UVTA. Civil Code section 3439.07.
- "The UFTA permits defrauded creditors to reach property in the hands of a transferee." (*Mejia, supra,* 31 Cal.4th at p. 663.)
- "A fraudulent conveyance under the UFTA involves 'a transfer by the debtor of property to a third person undertaken with the intent to prevent a creditor from reaching that interest to satisfy its claim.'" (*Filip v. Bucurenciu* (2005) 129 Cal.App.4th 825, 829 [28 Cal.Rptr.3d 884].)
- "Under the UFTA, 'a transfer of assets made by a debtor is fraudulent as to a creditor, whether the creditor's claim arose before or after the transfer, if the debtor made the transfer (1) with an actual intent to hinder, delay or defraud any creditor, or (2) without receiving reasonably equivalent value in

return, and either (a) was engaged in or about to engage in a business or transaction for which the debtor's assets were unreasonably small, or (b) intended to, or reasonably believed, or reasonably should have believed, that he or she would incur debts beyond his or her ability to pay as they became due.' " (*Hasso v. Hapke* (2014) 227 Cal.App.4th 107, 121−122 [173 Cal.Rptr.3d 356], internal citations omitted.)

- "[A] conveyance will not be considered fraudulent if the debtor merely transfers property which is otherwise exempt from liability for debts. That is, because the theory of the law is that it is fraudulent for a judgment debtor to divest himself of assets against which the creditor could execute, if execution by the creditor would be barred while the property is in the possession of the debtor, then the debtor's conveyance of that exempt property to a third person is not fraudulent." (*Yaesu Electronics Corp. v. Tamura* (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 8, 13 [33 Cal.Rptr.2d 283].)

- "A transfer is not voidable against a person 'who took in good faith and for a reasonably equivalent value or against any subsequent transferee.' " (*Filip, supra,* 129 Cal.App.4th at p. 830, internal citations omitted.)

- " '[T]he UFTA is not the exclusive remedy by which fraudulent conveyances and transfers may be attacked'; they 'may also be attacked by, as it were, a common law action.' " (*Wisden, supra,* 124 Cal.App.4th at p. 758, internal citation omitted.)

- "[E]ven if the Legislature intended that all fraudulent conveyance claims be brought under the UFTA, the Legislature could not thereby dispense with a right to jury trial that existed at common law when the California Constitution was adopted." (*Wisden, supra,* 124 Cal.App.4th at p. 758, internal citation omitted.)

- "Whether a conveyance was made with fraudulent intent is a question of fact, and proof often consists of inferences from the circumstances surrounding the transfer." (*Filip, supra,* 129 Cal.App.4th at p. 834, internal citations omitted.)

- "In order to constitute intent to defraud, it is not necessary that the transferor act maliciously with the desire of causing harm to one or more creditors." (*Economy Refining & Service Co. v. Royal Nat'l Bank* (1971) 20 Cal.App.3d 434, 441 [97 Cal.Rptr. 706].)

- "There is no minimum number of factors that must be present before the scales tip in favor of finding of actual intent to defraud. This list of factors is meant to provide guidance to the trial court, not compel a finding one way or the other." (*Filip, supra,* 129 Cal.App.4th at p. 834.)

- "A well-established principle of the law of fraudulent transfers is, 'A transfer in fraud of creditors may be attacked only by one who is injured thereby. Mere intent to delay or defraud is not sufficient; injury to the creditor must be shown affirmatively. In other words, prejudice to the plaintiff is essential. It cannot be said that a creditor has been injured unless the transfer puts beyond [her] reach property [she] otherwise would be able to subject to the payment of [her] debt.' " (*Mehrtash v. Mehrtash* (2001) 93 Cal.App.4th 75, 80 [112 Cal.Rptr.2d 802], internal citations omitted.)

- "[G]ranting [plaintiff judgment creditor] an additional judgment against [defendant judgment debtor] under the UFTA for … 'the amount transferred here to avoid paying part of his underlying judgment, *would in effect allow [him] to recover more than the underlying judgment*, which the [UFTA] does not allow.' (Italics added.) We thus conclude that because [plaintiff] obtained a judgment in the prior action for the damages [defendant] caused him, the principle against double recovery for the same harm bars him from obtaining a second judgment against her under the UFTA for a portion of those same damages." (*Renda v. Nevarez* (2014) 223 Cal.App.4th 1231, 1238 [167 Cal.Rptr.3d 874], original italics.)

Secondary Sources

8 Witkin, California Procedure (5th ed. 2008) Enforcement of Judgments, § 495 et seq.

Ahart, California Practice Guide: Enforcing Judgments & Debts, Ch. 4-C, *Prejudgment Collection—Prelawsuit Considerations*, ¶ 3:320 et seq. (The Rutter Group)

23 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances*, § 270.40 (Matthew Bender)

1 Goldsmith et al., Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Debt Collection and Enforcement of Judgments, Ch. 4, *Fraudulent Transfers*, 4.05

4201. Factors to Consider in Determining Actual Intent to Hinder, Delay, or Defraud (Civ. Code, § 3439.04(b))

In determining whether [*name of debtor***] intended to hinder, delay, or defraud any creditors by [transferring property/incurring an obligation] to [***name of defendant***], you may consider, among other factors, the following:**

[(a) Whether the [transfer/obligation] was to [a/an] [*insert relevant description of insider, e.g., "relative," "business partner," etc.***];]**

[(b) Whether [*name of debtor***] retained possession or control of the property after it was transferred;]**

[(c) Whether the [transfer/obligation] was disclosed or concealed;]

[(d) Whether before the [transfer was made/obligation was incurred] [*name of debtor***] had been sued or threatened with suit;]**

[(e) Whether the transfer was of substantially all of [*name of debtor***]'s assets;]**

[(f) Whether [*name of debtor***] fled;]**

[(g) Whether [*name of debtor***] removed or concealed assets;]**

[(h) Whether the value received by [*name of debtor***] was not reasonably equivalent to the value of the [asset transferred/amount of the obligation incurred];]**

[(i) Whether [*name of debtor***] was insolvent or became insolvent shortly after the [transfer was made/obligation was incurred];]**

[(j) Whether the transfer occurred shortly before or shortly after a substantial debt was incurred;]

[(k) Whether [*name of debtor***] transferred the essential assets of the business to a lienholder who transferred the assets to an insider of [***name of defendant***];] [and]**

[(*l*) [*insert other appropriate factor***].]**

Evidence of one or more factors does not automatically require a finding that [*name of defendant***] acted with the intent to hinder, delay, or defraud creditors. The presence of one or more of these factors is evidence that may suggest the intent to delay, hinder, or defraud.**

New June 2006; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

Some or all of the stated factors may not be necessary in every case. Other factors may be added as appropriate depending on the facts of the case.

Sources and Authority

- Determination of Actual Intent. Civil Code section 3439.04(b).

- "Over the years, courts have considered a number of factors, the 'badges of fraud' described in a Legislative Committee comment to section 3439.04, in determining actual intent. Effective January 1, 2005, those factors are now codified as section 3439.04, subdivision (b) and include considerations such as whether the transfer was made to an insider, whether the transferee retained possession or control after the property was transferred, whether the transfer was disclosed, whether the debtor had been sued or threatened with suit before the transfer was made, whether the value received by the debtor was reasonably equivalent to the value of the transferred asset, and similar concerns. According to section 3439.04, subdivision (c), this amendment 'does not constitute a change in, but is declaratory of, existing law.' " (*Filip v. Bucurenciu* (2005) 129 Cal.App.4th 825, 834 [28 Cal.Rptr.3d 884], internal citations omitted.)

- "[The factors in Civil Code section 3439.04(b)] do not create a mathematical formula to establish actual intent. There is no minimum number of factors that must be present before the scales tip in favor of finding of actual intent to defraud. This list of factors is meant to provide guidance to the trial court, not compel a finding one way or the other." (*Filip, supra,* 129 Cal.App.4th at p. 834.)

- "Even the existence of several 'badges of fraud' may be insufficient to raise a triable issue of material fact." (*Annod Corp. v. Hamilton & Samuels* (2002) 100 Cal.App.4th 1286, 1299 [123 Cal.Rptr.2d 924], internal citation omitted.)

- "Whether a conveyance was made with fraudulent intent is a question of fact, and proof often consists of inferences from the circumstances surrounding the transfer." (*Filip, supra,* 129 Cal.App.4th at p. 834, internal citation omitted.)

Secondary Sources

9 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 94, *Bankruptcy*, § 94.55[4][b] (Matthew Bender)

23 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances*, § 270.40 (Matthew Bender)

4202. Constructive Fraudulent Transfer—No Reasonably Equivalent Value Received—Essential Factual Elements (Civ. Code, § 3439.04(a)(2))

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims [he/she/it] was harmed because [***name of debtor***] [transferred property/incurred an obligation] to [***name of defendant***] and, as a result, was unable to pay [***name of plaintiff***] money that was owed. [This is called "constructive fraud."] To establish this claim against [***name of defendant***], [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***] has a right to payment from [***name of debtor***] for [***insert amount of claim***];**

2. **That [***name of debtor***] [transferred property/incurred an obligation] to [***name of defendant***];**

3. **That [***name of debtor***] did not receive a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the [transfer/obligation];**

4. **[That [***name of debtor***] was in business or about to start a business or enter a transaction when [his/her/its] remaining assets were unreasonably small for the business or transaction;] [or]**

   [That [*name of debtor***] intended to incur debts beyond [his/her/its] ability to pay as they became due;] [or]**

   [That [*name of debtor***] believed or reasonably should have believed that [he/she/it] would incur debts beyond [his/her/its] ability to pay as they became due;]**

5. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

6. **That [***name of debtor***]'s conduct was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

If you decide that [*name of plaintiff***] has proved all of the above, [he/she/it] does not have to prove that [***name of debtor***] intended to defraud any creditors.**

[It does not matter whether [*name of plaintiff***]'s right to payment arose before or after [***name of debtor***] [transferred property/incurred an obligation].]**

New June 2006; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

Under the Uniform Voidable Transactions Act (formerly the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act), a transfer made or obligation incurred by a debtor is voidable as to a creditor, whether the creditor's claim arose before or after the transfer was made or the obligation was incurred, if the debtor made the transfer or incurred the obligation without receiving a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the transfer or

obligation, and the debtor either: (1) was engaged or was about to engage in a business or a transaction for which the remaining assets of the debtor were unreasonably small in relation to the business or transaction; or (2) intended to incur, or believed or reasonably should have believed that the debtor would incur, debts beyond the debtor's ability to pay as they became due. (Civ. Code, § 3439.04(a)(2).)

This instruction assumes the defendant is a transferee of the original debtor. Read the bracketed second sentence ~~in cases in which~~if the plaintiff is asserting ~~causes of action~~claims for both actual and constructive fraud. Read the last bracketed sentence ~~in cases where~~if the plaintiff's alleged claim arose after the defendant's property was transferred or the obligation was incurred.

Courts have held that there is a right to a jury trial whenever the remedy sought is monetary relief, including even the return of a "determinate sum of money." (*Wisden v. Superior Court* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 750, 757 [21 Cal.Rptr.3d 523], internal citation omitted.) If the only remedy sought is the return of a particular nonmonetary asset, the action is an equitable action. However, even ~~where~~ if a specific nonmonetary asset is involved, a conspiracy claim or an action against any party other than the transferee who possesses the asset (e.g., "the person for whose benefit the transfer was made" (Civ. Code, § 3439.08(b)(1)(A)) necessarily would seek monetary relief and give rise to a right to a jury trial.

Sources and Authority

- ~~When Transfer Is Fraudulent~~Transfer Without Reasonably Equivalent Value in Exchange. Civil Code section 3439.04(a)(2).

- When Value Is Given. Civil Code section 3439.03.

- "There are two forms of constructive fraud under the UFTA. Civil Code section 3439.04 … provides that a transfer is fraudulent if the debtor did not receive reasonably equivalent consideration and either '(1) Was engaged or about to engage in a business or a transaction for which the remaining assets of the debtor were unreasonably small in relation to the business or transaction; or (2) Intended to incur, or believed or reasonably should have believed that he or she would incur, debts beyond his or her ability to pay as they became due.' Civil Code section 3439.05 provides that a transfer is fraudulent as to an existing creditor if the debtor does not receive reasonably equivalent value and 'was insolvent at that time or ... became insolvent as a result of the transfer ... .' " (*Mejia v. Reed* (2003) 31 Cal.4th 657, 669–670 [3 Cal.Rptr.3d 390, 74 P.3d 166].)

- "A well-established principle of the law of fraudulent transfers is, 'A transfer in fraud of creditors may be attacked only by one who is injured thereby. Mere intent to delay or defraud is not sufficient; injury to the creditor must be shown affirmatively. In other words, prejudice to the plaintiff is essential. It cannot be said that a creditor has been injured unless the transfer puts beyond [her] reach property [she] otherwise would be able to subject to the payment of [her] debt.' " (*Mehrtash v. Mehrtash* (2001) 93 Cal.App.4th 75, 80 [112 Cal.Rptr.2d 802], internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

17 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake*, §§ 215.70[5], 215.111[2][c] (Matthew Bender)

23 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances*, §§ 270.42, 270.193, 270.194 (Matthew Bender)

4203. Constructive Fraudulent Transfer—(Insolvency)—Essential Factual Elements (Civ. Code, § 3439.05)

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims [he/she/it] was harmed because [***name of debtor***] [transferred property/incurred an obligation] to [***name of defendant***] and was unable to pay [***name of plaintiff***] money that was owed. [This is called "constructive fraud."] To establish this claim against [***name of defendant***], [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***] has a right to payment from [***name of debtor***] for [***insert amount of claim***];**

2. **That [***name of debtor***] [transferred property/incurred an obligation] to [***name of defendant***];**

3. **That [***name of debtor***] did not receive a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the [transfer/obligation];**

4. **That [***name of plaintiff***]'s right to payment from [***name of debtor***] arose before [***name of debtor***] [transferred property/incurred an obligation];**

5. **That [***name of debtor***] was insolvent at that time or became insolvent as a result of the transfer or obligation;**

6. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

7. **That [***name of debtor***]'s conduct was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

If you decide that [*name of plaintiff***] has proved all of the above, [he/she/it] does not have to prove that [***name of debtor***] intended to defraud creditors.**

New June 2006; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

Under the Uniform Voidable Transactions Act (formerly the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act), a transfer made or obligation incurred by a debtor is voidable as to a creditor whose claim arose before the transfer was made or the obligation was incurred if the debtor made the transfer or incurred the obligation without receiving a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the transfer or obligation and the debtor was insolvent at that time or the debtor became insolvent as a result of the transfer or obligation. (Civ. Code, § 3439.05.)

This instruction assumes the defendant is a transferee of the debtor. This instruction may be used along with CACI No. 4202, *Constructive Fraudulent Transfer—Essential Factual Elements,* ~~in cases where~~if it is alleged that the plaintiff became a creditor before the transfer was made or the obligation was incurred. Read the bracketed second sentence in cases in which the plaintiff is asserting causes of action for both

actual and constructive fraud. Also give CACI Nos. 4205, *"Insolvency" Explained*, and 4206, *Presumption of Insolvency*.

Courts have held that there is a right to a jury trial whenever the remedy sought is monetary relief, including even the return of a "determinate sum of money." (*Wisden v. Superior Court* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 750, 757 [21 Cal.Rptr.3d 523], internal citation omitted.) If the only remedy sought is the return of a particular nonmonetary asset, the action is an equitable action. However, even ~~where~~ if a specific nonmonetary asset is involved, a conspiracy claim or an action against any party other than the transferee who possesses the asset (e.g., "the person for whose benefit the transfer was made" (Civ. Code, § 3439.08(b)(1)(A)) necessarily would seek monetary relief and give rise to a right to a jury trial.

Sources and Authority

- ~~When Transfer Is Fraudulent~~Voidable Transaction Involving Insolvency. Civil Code section 3439.05.
- When Value Is Given. Civil Code section 3439.03.
- "There are two forms of constructive fraud under the UFTA. Civil Code section 3439.04 … provides that a transfer is fraudulent if the debtor did not receive reasonably equivalent consideration and either '(1) Was engaged or about to engage in a business or a transaction for which the remaining assets of the debtor were unreasonably small in relation to the business or transaction; or (2) Intended to incur, or believed or reasonably should have believed that he or she would incur, debts beyond his or her ability to pay as they became due.' Civil Code section 3439.05 provides that a transfer is fraudulent as to an existing creditor if the debtor does not receive reasonably equivalent value and 'was insolvent at that time or ... became insolvent as a result of the transfer ... .' " (*Mejia v. Reed* (2003) 31 Cal.4th 657, 669–670 [3 Cal.Rptr.3d 390, 74 P.3d 166].)
- "A well-established principle of the law of fraudulent transfers is, 'A transfer in fraud of creditors may be attacked only by one who is injured thereby. Mere intent to delay or defraud is not sufficient; injury to the creditor must be shown affirmatively. In other words, prejudice to the plaintiff is essential. It cannot be said that a creditor has been injured unless the transfer puts beyond [her] reach property [she] otherwise would be able to subject to the payment of [her] debt.' " (*Mehrtash v. Mehrtash* (2001) 93 Cal.App.4th 75, 80 [112 Cal.Rptr.2d 802], internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

17 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake*, §§ 215.70[5], 215.111[2][c] (Matthew Bender)

23 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances*, §§ 270.42, 270.191, 270.192 (Matthew Bender)

4204. "Transfer" Explained

"Transfer" means every method of parting with a debtor's property or an interest in a debtor's property.

[*Read one of the following options:***]**

[A transfer may be direct or indirect, absolute or conditional, ~~or~~ voluntary or involuntary. A transfer includes [the payment of money/a release/a lease/a license/ [and] the creation of a lien or other encumbrance].]

[In this case, [*describe transaction***] is a transfer.]**

New June 2006; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

This instruction sets forth the statutory definition of a "transfer" within the Uniform Voidable Transactions Act (formerly the Uniform Fraudulent Transfers Act). (See Civ. Code, § 3439.01(m).) ~~Include only the bracketed terms at the end of the third sentence that are at issue in the case.~~ Read the second bracketed ~~sentence~~ option for the second sentence if the transaction has been stipulated to or determined as a matter of law. Otherwise, read the first bracketed option. Include only the bracketed terms at the end of the ~~third sentence~~first option that are at issue in the case.

Sources and Authority

- "Transfer" Defined. Civil Code section 3439.01(~~i~~m).

- ~~Nonvoidable Transfers. Civil Code section 3439.08(c).~~

- "On its face, the UFTA applies to all transfers. Civil Code, section § 3439.01, subdivision (i) defines '[t]ransfer' as 'every mode, direct or indirect, absolute or conditional, voluntary or involuntary, of disposing of or parting with an asset or an interest in an asset ... .' The UFTA excepts only certain transfers resulting from lease terminations or lien enforcement." (*Mejia v. Reed* (2003) 31 Cal.4th 657, 664 [3 Cal.Rptr.3d 390, 74 P.3d 166], internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

23 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances*, §§ 270.35[1], 270.37 (Matthew Bender)

4205. "Insolvency" Explained

[[*Name of debtor***] was insolvent [at the time/as a result] of the transaction if, at fair valuations, the total amount of [his/her/its] debts was greater than the total amount of [his/her/its] assets.]**

In determining [*name of debtor***]'s assets, do not include property that has been [transferred, concealed, or removed with intent to hinder, delay, or defraud creditors/ [or] transferred [***specify grounds for voidable transfer based on constructive fraud***]]. [In determining [***name of debtor***]'s debts, do not include a debt to the extent it is secured by a valid lien on [his/her/its] property that is not included as an asset.]**

New June 2006; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

Give this instruction with CACI No. 4203, *Constructive Fraudulent Transfer—Insolvency—Essential Factual Elements*. Give also CACI No. 4206, *Presumption of Insolvency.*

Property that is potentially voidable under the Uniform Voidable Transactions Act (formerly the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act) is to be excluded from the computation of the debtor's assets for purposes of determining insolvency. (Civ. Code, § 3439.02(c).) In the first sentence of the second paragraph select the first option if there is property transferred and alleged to be voidable for actual fraud (see Civ. Code, § 3439.04(a)(1).), and specify the grounds in the second option if there is property transferred and alleged to be voidable for constructive fraud. (See Civ. Code, §§ 3439.04(a)(2), 3904.05.)~~If the debtor is a partnership, refer to Civil Code section 3439.02(b). If there are issues regarding specific assets, see Civil Code sections 3439.02(e) and 3439.01(a).~~

Read the bracketed last sentence if appropriate to the facts. (See Civ. Code, § 3439.02(d).)

Sources and Authority

- When Debtor Is Insolvent. Civil Code section 3439.02.
- "Asset" Defined. Civil Code section 3439.01(a).
- "To determine solvency, the value of a debtor's assets and debts are compared. By statutory definition, a debtor's assets exclude property that is exempt from judgment enforcement. Retirement accounts are generally exempt." (*Mejia v. Reed* (2003) 31 Cal.4th 657, 670 [3 Cal.Rptr.3d 390, 74 P.3d 166], internal citations omitted.)
- "We conclude … that future child support payments should not be viewed as a debt under the UFTA." (*Mejia, supra*, 31 Cal.4th at p. 671.)

Secondary Sources

23 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances*, §§ 270.42[3], 270.192 (Matthew Bender)

26 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 307, *Insolvency*, § 307.32 (Matthew Bender)

4206. Presumption of Insolvency

A debtor who is generally not paying [his/her/its] debts as they become due, other than because of a legitimate dispute, is presumed to be insolvent.

In determining whether [*name of debtor***] was generally not paying [his/her/its] debts as they became due, you may consider all of the following:**

(a) The number of [*name of debtor***]'s debts;**

(b) The percentage of debts that were not being paid;

(c) How long those debts remained unpaid;

(d) Whether ~~legitimate disputes or other~~ special circumstances explain any failure to pay the debts; and

(e) [*Name of debtor***]'s payment practices before the period of alleged nonpayment [and the payment practices of [***name of debtor***]'s [trade/industry]].**

If [*name of plaintiff***] proves that [***name of debtor***] was generally not paying debts as they became due, then you must~~should~~ find that [***name of debtor***] was insolvent unless [***name of defendant***] proves that [***name of debtor***] was solvent.**

New June 2006; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

This instruction should be read in conjunction with CACI Nos. 4203, *Constructive Fraudulent Transfer—Insolvency—Essential Factual Elements*, and 4205, *Insolvency Explained*.

Sources and Authority

- Presumption of Insolvency. Civil Code section 3439.02(~~c~~b).
- ~~The Legislative Committee Comment to Civil Code section 3439.02 states:~~ "Subdivision (c) [now subdivision (b)] establishes a rebuttable presumption of insolvency from the fact of general nonpayment of debts as they become due. … The presumption imposes on the party against whom the presumption is directed the burden of proving that the nonexistence of insolvency as defined in subdivision (a) is more probable than its existence." (Legislative Committee Comment to Civil Code section 3439.02.)
- ~~The Legislative Committee Comment to Civil Code section 3439.02 states:~~ "In determining whether a debtor is paying its debts generally as they become due, the court should look at more than the

amount and due dates of the indebtedness. The court should also take into account such factors as the number of the debtor's debts, the proportion of those debts not being paid, the duration of the nonpayment, and the existence of bona fide disputes or other special circumstances alleged to constitute an explanation for the stoppage of payments. The court's determination may be affected by a consideration of the debtor's payment practices prior to the period of alleged nonpayment and the payment practices of the trade or industry in which the debtor is engaged." (Legislative Committee Comment to Civil Code section 3439.02.)

Secondary Sources

23 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances*, § 270.42[3][e], [4] (Matthew Bender)

26 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 307, *Insolvency*, § 307.20 (Matthew Bender)

4207. Affirmative Defense—Good Faith (Civ. Code, § 3439.08(a), (f)(1))

[*Name of defendant***] ~~claims [he/she/it]~~ is not liable to [***name of plaintiff***] [on the claim for actual fraud] if ~~because [***name of defendant***] [***insert one of the following:***]~~**

> **~~[took the property from [***name of debtor***] in good faith and for a reasonably equivalent value.]~~**
>
> ***~~[or]~~***
>
> **~~[received the property from someone who had taken the property from [***name of debtor***] in good faith and for a reasonably equivalent value.]~~**

~~To succeed on this defense,~~ [*name of defendant***] ~~must~~ proves both of the following:**

[Use one of the following two sets of elements:]

> **[1. That [***name of defendant***] took the property from [***name of debtor***] in good faith; and**
>
> **2. That [he/she/it] took the property for a reasonably equivalent value.]**
>
> *[or]*
>
> **[1. That [***name of defendant***] received the property from [***name of third party***], who had taken the property from [***name of debtor***] in good faith; and**
>
> **2. That [***name of third party***] had taken the property for a reasonably equivalent value.]**

"Good faith" means that [*name of defendant/third party***] acted without actual fraudulent intent and that [he/she/it] did not conspire with [***name of debtor***] or otherwise actively participate in any fraudulent scheme. If you decide that [***name of debtor***] had fraudulent intent and that [***name of defendant/third party***] knew it, then you may consider [his/her/its] knowledge in combination with other facts in deciding the question of [***name of defendant/third party***]'s good faith.**

New June 2006; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

This instruction ~~is appropriate~~presents a defense that is available to a good-faith transferee for value in cases involving allegations of actual fraud under the Uniform ~~Fraudulent Transfer~~Voidable Transactions Act (formerly the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act). (See Civ. Code, § 3439.08(a), (f)(1).) Include t~~T~~he bracketed language in the first sentence ~~is not necessary~~ if the plaintiff is bringing ~~a~~ claims for both actual fraud and constructive fraud~~only~~.

Sources and Authority

- Transaction Not Voidable as to Good-Faith Transferee for Reasonable Value~~; Remedies~~. Civil Code section 3439.08(a).

- Transferee's Burden of Proving Good Faith and Reasonable Value. Civil Code section 3439.08(f)(1).

- When Value is Given. Civil Code section 3439.03.

- "The Legislative Committee comment to Civil Code section 3439.08, subdivision (a), provides that 'good faith,' within the meaning of the provision, 'means that the transferee acted without actual fraudulent intent and that he or she did not collude with the debtor or otherwise actively participate in the fraudulent scheme of the debtor. The transferee's knowledge of the transferor's fraudulent intent may, in combination with other facts, be relevant on the issue of the transferee's good faith … .' " (*Annod Corp. v. Hamilton & Samuels* (2002) 100 Cal.App.4th 1286, 1299 [123 Cal.Rptr.2d 924], internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

23 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances*, §§ 270.35[2], 270.44[1], 270.47[2], [3] (Matthew Bender)

4208. Affirmative Defense—Statute of Limitations—Actual and Constructive Fraud (Civ. Code, § 3439.09)

[*Name of defendant*] contends that [*name of plaintiff*]'s lawsuit was not filed within the time set by law.

[[With respect to [*name of plaintiff*]'s claim of actual intent to hinder, delay, or defraud,] [To/to] succeed on this defense, [*name of defendant*] must prove that [*name of plaintiff*] ~~did not file~~filed [his/her/its] lawsuit ~~within~~ later than four years after the [transfer was made/obligation was incurred] [or, if later than four years, ~~within~~ no later than one year after the [transfer/obligation] was or could reasonably have been discovered by [*name of plaintiff*]]. But in any event, the lawsuit must have been filed within seven years after the [transfer was made/the obligation was incurred].]

[[With respect to [*name of plaintiff*]'s claim of constructive fraud,] [To/to] succeed on this defense, [*name of defendant*] must prove that [*name of plaintiff*] ~~did not file~~filed [his/her/its] lawsuit ~~within~~ later than four years after the [transfer was made/obligation was incurred].]

New June 2006; Revised December 2007, June 2016

Directions for Use

This instruction provides an affirmative defense for failure to file within the statute of limitations. (See Civ. Code, § 3439.09.) Read the first bracketed paragraph regarding delayed discovery in cases involving actual ~~fraud~~intent to hinder, delay or defraud. See Civ. Code, § 3439.04(a)(1); CACI No. 4200.) ~~,~~ ~~and~~Read the second in cases involving constructive fraud. (See Civ. Code, §§ 3439.04(a)(2), 3439.05; CACI Nos. 4202, 4203.) ~~Do not r~~Read the first bracketed phrases in those paragraphs ~~unless~~ if the plaintiff has brought both actual and constructive fraud claims. ~~This instruction applies only to claims brought under the UFTA.~~

Sources and Authority

- Statute of Limitations. Civil Code section 3439.09.

- "[T]he UFTA is not the exclusive remedy by which fraudulent conveyances and transfers may be attacked. They may also be attacked by, as it were, a common law action. If and as such an action is brought, the applicable statute of limitations is section 338 (d) and, more importantly, the cause of action accrues not when the fraudulent transfer occurs but when the judgment against the debtor is secured (or maybe even later, depending upon the belated discovery issue)." (*Macedo v. Bosio* (2001) 86 Cal.App.4th 1044, 1051 [104 Cal.Rptr.2d 1].)

- "In the context of the scheme of law of which section 3934.09 is a part, where an alleged fraudulent transfer occurs while an action seeking to establish the underlying liability is pending, and where a judgment establishing the liability later becomes final, we construe the four-year limitation period, i.e., the language, 'four years after the transfer was made or the obligation was incurred,' " to

accommodate a tolling until the underlying liability becomes fixed by a final judgment." (*Cortez v. Vogt* (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 917, 920 [60 Cal.Rptr.2d 841].)

Secondary Sources

23 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances*, §§ 270.49, 270.50 (Matthew Bender)

VF-4200. Actual Intent to Hinder, Delay, or Defraud Creditor—Affirmative Defense—Good Faith

We answer the questions submitted to us as follows:

1. **Did [***name of plaintiff***] have a right to payment from [***name of debtor***]?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 1 is yes, then answer question 2. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

2. **Did [***name of debtor***] [transfer property/incur an obligation] to [***name of defendant***]?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 2 is yes, then answer question 3. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

3. **Did [***name of debtor***] [transfer the property/incur the obligation] with the intent to hinder, delay, or defraud one or more of [his/her/its] creditors?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

4. **Was [***name of debtor***]'s conduct a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 4 is yes, then answer question 5. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

5. **Did [[***name of defendant***]/[***name of third party***]] receive the property from [***name of debtor***] in good faith?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 5 is yes, then answer question 6. If you answered no, skip question 6 and answer question 7.

6. **Did [[***name of defendant***]/[***name of third party***]] receive the property for a reasonably equivalent value?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 6 is yes, stop here, answer no further questions, and have

the presiding juror sign and date this form. If you answered no, then answer question 7.

7. What are [*name of plaintiff*]'s damages?

TOTAL $ _____

Signed: _____
Presiding Juror

Dated: _____

After [this verdict form has/all verdict forms have] been signed, notify the [clerk/bailiff/court attendant] that you are ready to present your verdict in the courtroom.

New December 2011; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

This verdict form is based on CACI No. 4200, *Actual Intent to Hinder, Delay, or Defraud a Creditor—Essential Factual Elements*, and CACI No. 4207, *Affirmative Defense—Good Faith*. The defendant is the transferee of the property. The transferee may have received the property in good faith even though the debtor had a fraudulent intent. (See *Annod Corp. v. Hamilton & Samuels* (2002) 100 Cal.App.4th 1286, 1299 [123 Cal.Rptr.2d 924].)

The special verdict forms in this section are intended only as models. They may need to be modified depending on the facts of the case.

~~This verdict form is based on CACI No. 4200, *Actual Intent to Defraud a Creditor—Essential Factual Elements*, and CACI No. 4207, *Affirmative Defense—Good Faith*. The defendant is the transferee of the property. The transferee may have received the property in good faith even though the debtor had a fraudulent intent. (See *Annod Corp. v. Hamilton & Samuels* (2002) 100 Cal.App.4th 1286, 1299 [123 Cal.Rptr.2d 924].)~~

If there are multiple causes of action, users may wish to combine the individual forms into one form. If different damages are recoverable on different causes of action, replace the damages tables in all of the verdict forms with CACI No. VF-3920, *Damages on Multiple Legal Theories*.

This form may be modified if the jury is being given the discretion under Civil Code section 3288 to award prejudgment interest on specific losses that occurred prior to judgment.

VF-4201. Constructive Fraudulent Transfer—No Reasonably Equivalent Value Received

We answer the questions submitted to us as follows:

1. **Did [*name of plaintiff*] have a right to payment from [*name of debtor*]?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 1 is yes, then answer question 2. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

2. **Did [*name of debtor*] [transfer property/incur an obligation] to [*name of defendant*]?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 2 is yes, then answer question 3. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

3. **Did [*name of debtor*] fail to receive a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the [transfer/obligation]?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

4. **[[Was [*name of debtor*] [in business/about to start a business]/Did [*name of debtor*] enter into a transaction] when [his/her/its] remaining assets were unreasonably small for the [business/transaction]?]**

   [*or*]

   [Did [*name of debtor*] intend to incur debts beyond [his/her/its] ability to pay as they became due?]

   [*or*]

   [Did [*name of debtor*] believe or should [he/she/it] reasonably have believed that [he/she/it] would incur debts beyond [his/her/its] ability to pay as they became due?]
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 4 is yes, then answer question 5. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

5. **Was [*name of debtor*]'s conduct a substantial factor in causing [*name of plaintiff*]'s harm?**

____ Yes ____ No

If your answer to question 5 is yes, then answer question 6. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

6. What are [*name of plaintiff*]'s damages?

TOTAL $ _____

Signed: _____
Presiding Juror

Dated: _____

After [this verdict form has/all verdict forms have] been signed, notify the [clerk/bailiff/court attendant] that you are ready to present your verdict in the courtroom.

New December 2011; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

This verdict form is based on CACI No. 4202, *Constructive Fraudulent Transfer— No Reasonably Equivalent Value Received—Essential Factual Elements.*

The special verdict forms in this section are intended only as models. They may need to be modified depending on the facts of the case.

~~This verdict form is based on CACI No. 4202, *Constructive Fraudulent Transfer—Essential Factual Elements.*~~

If there are multiple causes of action, users may wish to combine the individual forms into one form. If different damages are recoverable on different causes of action, replace the damages tables in all of the verdict forms with CACI No. VF-3920, *Damages on Multiple Legal Theories*.

This form may be modified if the jury is being given the discretion under Civil Code section 3288 to award prejudgment interest on specific losses that occurred prior to judgment.

VF-4202. Constructive Fraudulent Transfer—Insolvency

We answer the questions submitted to us as follows:

1. **Did [***name of plaintiff***] have a right to payment from [***name of debtor***]?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 1 is yes, then answer question 2. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

2. **Did [***name of debtor***] [transfer property/incur an obligation] to [***name of defendant***]?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 2 is yes, then answer question 3. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

3. **Did [***name of debtor***] fail to receive a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the [transfer/obligation]?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

4. **Did [***name of plaintiff***]'s right to payment from [***name of debtor***] arise before [***name of debtor***] [transferred property/incurred an obligation]?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 4 is yes, then answer question 5. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

5. **Was [***name of debtor***] insolvent at that time or did [***name of debtor***] become insolvent as a result of the [transfer/ obligation]?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

   If your answer to question 5 is yes, then answer question 6. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

6. **Was [***name of debtor***]'s conduct a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm?**
   ____ Yes ____ No

If your answer to question 6 is yes, then answer question 7. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form.

7. What are [*name of plaintiff*]'s damages?

TOTAL $ _____

Signed: _____
Presiding Juror

Dated: _____

After [this verdict form has/all verdict forms have] been signed, notify the [clerk/bailiff/court attendant] that you are ready to present your verdict in the courtroom.

New December 2011

Directions for Use

This verdict form is based on CACI No. 4203, *Constructive Fraudulent Transfer ~~(Insolvency)~~ Essential Factual Elements.*

The special verdict forms in this section are intended only as models. They may need to be modified depending on the facts of the case.

~~This verdict form is based on CACI No. 4203, *Constructive Fraudulent Transfer (Insolvency)—Essential Factual Elements.*~~

If there are multiple causes of action, users may wish to combine the individual forms into one form. If different damages are recoverable on different causes of action, replace the damages tables in all of the verdict forms with CACI No. VF-3920, *Damages on Multiple Legal Theories*.

This form may be modified if the jury is being given the discretion under Civil Code section 3288 to award prejudgment interest on specific losses that occurred prior to judgment.

4560. Recovery of Payments to Unlicensed Contractor (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 7031(b))

[*Name of plaintiff*] claims that [*name of defendant*] did not have a valid contractor's license during all times when [*name of defendant*] was performing services for [*name of plaintiff*] under their contract. To establish this claim, [*name of plaintiff*] must prove both of the following:

1. **That there was a contract between [*name of plaintiff*] and [*name of defendant*] under which [*name of defendant*] was required to perform services for [*name of plaintiff*];**

2. **That a valid contractor's license was required to perform these services;**

3. **That [*name of defendant*] performed and was compensated for contractor services for the [*name of plaintiff*] as required by the contract;**

[*Name of defendant*] must then prove that while performing these services, [he/she/it] had a valid contractor's license at all times as required by law.

New June 2016

Directions for Use

Give this instruction in a case in which the plaintiff seeks to recover money paid to an unlicensed contractor for service performed for which a license is required. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 7031(b).) It may be modified for use if an allegedly unlicensed contractor brings a claim for payment for services performed. (See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 7031(a).)

The burden of proof to establish licensure or proper licensure is on the licensee. Proof must be made by producing a verified certificate of licensure from the Contractors' State License Board. When licensure or proper licensure is controverted, the burden of proof to establish licensure or proper licensure is on the contractor. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 7031(d).)

A corporation qualifies for a contractor's license through a responsible managing officer (RMO) or responsible managing employee (RME) who is qualified for the same license classification as the classification being applied for. (Bus & Prof. Code § 7068(b)(3).) The plaintiff may attack a contractor's license by going behind the face of the license and proving that a required RMO or RME is a sham. The burden of proof remains with the contractor to prove a bona fide RMO or RME. (*Buzgheia v. Leasco Sierra Grove* (1997) 60 Cal.App.4th 374, 385−387 [70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 427].) Whether an RMO or RME is a sham can be a question of fact. (*Jeff Tracy, Inc. v. City of Pico Rivera* (2015) 240 Cal.App.4th 510, 518 [192 Cal.Rptr.3d 600].)

Sources and Authority

- Action to recover compensation paid to unlicensed contractor. Business and Professions Code section 7031(b).

- Proof of licensure. Business and Professions Code section 7031(d).

- "Contractor" defined. Business and Professions Code section 7026.

- "The purpose of the licensing law is to protect the public from incompetence and dishonesty in those who provide building and construction services. The licensing requirements provide minimal assurance that all persons offering such services in California have the requisite skill and character, understand applicable local laws and codes, and know the rudiments of administering a contracting business." (*Hydrotech Systems, Ltd. v. Oasis Waterpark* (1991) 52 Cal.3d 988, 995 [277 Cal. Rptr. 517, 803 P.2d 370], internal citations omitted.)

- "Because of the strength and clarity of this policy, it is well settled that section 7031 applies despite injustice to the unlicensed contractor. 'Section 7031 represents a legislative determination that the importance of deterring unlicensed persons from engaging in the contracting business *outweighs any harshness between the parties*, and that such deterrence can best be realized by denying violators the right to maintain any action for compensation in the courts of this state. [Citation.] . . .' " (*Hydrotech Systems, Ltd., supra*, 52 Cal.3d at p. 995, original italics.)

- "The current legislative requirement that a contractor plaintiff must, in addition to proving the traditional elements of a contract claim, also prove that it was duly licensed at all times during the performance of the contract does not change this historical right to a jury trial." (*Jeff Tracy, Inc., supra*, 240 Cal.App.4th at p. 518, fn. 2.)

- "[T]he courts may not resort to equitable considerations in defiance of section 7031." (*Lewis & Queen v. N. M. Ball Sons* (1957) 48 Cal.2d 141, 152 [308 P.2d 713].)

- "In 2001, the Legislature complemented the shield created by subdivision (a) of section 7031 by adding a sword that allows persons who utilize unlicensed contractors to recover compensation paid to the contractor for performing unlicensed work. Section 7031(b) provides that 'a person who utilizes the services of an unlicensed contractor may bring an action in any court of competent jurisdiction in this state to recover all compensation paid to the unlicensed contractor for performance of any act or contract' unless the substantial compliance doctrine applies." (*White v. Cridlebaugh* (2009) 178 Cal.App.4th 506, 519 [100 Cal.Rptr.3d 434], internal citation omitted.)

- "It appears section 7031(b) was designed to treat persons who have utilized unlicensed contractors consistently, regardless of whether they have paid the contractor for the unlicensed work. In short, those who have not paid are protected from being sued for payment and those who have paid may recover all compensation delivered. Thus, unlicensed contractors are not able to avoid the full measure of the CSLL's civil penalties by (1) requiring prepayment before undertaking the next increment of unlicensed work or (2) retaining progress payments relating to completed phases of the construction." (*White, supra,* 178 Cal.App.4th at p. 520.)

- "In most cases, a contractor can establish valid licensure by simply producing 'a verified

certificate of licensure from the Contractors' State License Board which establishes that the individual or entity bringing the action was duly licensed in the proper classification of contractors at all times during the performance of any act or contract covered by the action.' [contractor] concedes that if this was the only evidence at issue, 'then—perhaps—the issue could be decided by the court without a jury.' But as [contractor] points out, the City was challenging [contractor]'s license by going behind the face of the license to prove that [license holder] was a sham RME or RMO. (*Jeff Tracy, Inc., supra,* 240 Cal.App.4th at p. 518.)

- "[T]he determination of whether [contractor] held a valid class A license involved questions of fact. '[W]here there is a conflict in the evidence from which either conclusion could be reached as to the status of the parties, the question must be submitted to the jury. [Citations.] This rule is clearly applicable to cases revolving around the disputed right of a party to bring suit under the provisions of Business and Professions Code section 7031.' " (*Jeff Tracy, Inc., supra,* 240 Cal.App.4th at p. 518.)

- "We conclude the authorization of recovery of 'all compensation paid to the unlicensed contractor for performance of any act or contract' means that unlicensed contractors are required to return all compensation received without reductions or offsets for the value of material or services provided." (*White, supra,* 178 Cal.App.4th at pp. 520−521, internal citation omitted.)

- "[A]n unlicensed contractor is subject to forfeiture even if the other contracting party was aware of the contractor's lack of a license, and the other party's bad faith or unjust enrichment cannot be asserted by the contractor as a defense to forfeiture." (*Judicial Council of California v. Jacobs Facilities, Inc.* (2015) 239 Cal.App.4th 882, 896 [191 Cal.Rptr.3d 714].)

Secondary Sources

4561. Damages—All Payments Made to Unlicensed Contractor

A person who pays money under a contract to an unlicensed contractor may recover all compensation paid to the unlicensed contractor under the contract.

If you decide that [*name of plaintiff***] has proved that [he/she/it] paid money to [***name of defendant***] for services under the contract and that [***name of defendant***] was unlicensed at any time during performance, then [***name of plaintiff***] is entitled to the return of all amounts paid, not just the amounts paid while [***name of defendant***] was unlicensed. The fact that [***name of plaintiff***] may have received some or all of the benefits of [***name of defendant***]'s performance does not affect [his/her/its] right to the return of all amounts paid.**

New June 2016

Directions for Use

Give this instruction to clarify that the plaintiff is entitled to recover all compensation paid to the unlicensed defendant regardless of any seeming injustice to the contractor. (See *Hydrotech Systems, Ltd. v. Oasis Waterpark* (1991) 52 Cal.3d 988, 995 [277 Cal. Rptr. 517, 803 P.2d 370].) It may be modified for use if an allegedly unlicensed contractor brings a claim for payment for services performed. (See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 7031(a).)

Sources and Authority

- "Because of the strength and clarity of this policy, it is well settled that section 7031 applies despite injustice to the unlicensed contractor. 'Section 7031 represents a legislative determination that the importance of deterring unlicensed persons from engaging in the contracting business *outweighs any harshness between the parties*, and that such deterrence can best be realized by denying violators the right to maintain any action for compensation in the courts of this state. [Citation.] . . .' " (*Hydrotech Systems, Ltd., supra*, 52 Cal.3d at p. 995, original italics.)

- "[T]he courts may not resort to equitable considerations in defiance of section 7031." (*Lewis & Queen v. N. M. Ball Sons* (1957) 48 Cal.2d 141, 152 [308 P.2d 713].)

- "[I]f a contractor is unlicensed for any period of time while delivering construction services, the contractor forfeits all compensation for the work, not merely compensation for the period when the contractor was unlicensed." (*Judicial Council of California v. Jacobs Facilities, Inc.* (2015) 239 Cal.App.4th 882, 896 [191 Cal.Rptr.3d 714].)

- "We conclude the authorization of recovery of 'all compensation paid to the unlicensed contractor for performance of any act or contract' means that unlicensed contractors are required to return all compensation received without reductions or offsets for the value of material or services provided." (*White v. Cridlebaugh* (2009) 178 Cal.App.4th 506, 520−521 [100 Cal.Rptr.3d 434], internal citation omitted.)

-

Secondary Sources

4603. Whistleblower Protection—Essential Factual Elements (Lab. Code, § 1102.5)

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] [discharged/[***other adverse employment action***]] [him/her] in retaliation for [his/her] [disclosure of information of/refusal to participate in] an unlawful act. In order to establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] was [***name of plaintiff***]'s employer;**

2. **[That [***name of defendant***] believed that [***name of plaintiff***] [had disclosed/might disclose] to a [government agency/law enforcement agency/person with authority over [***name of plaintiff***]/ [or] an employee with authority to investigate, discover, or correct legal [violations/noncompliance]] that [***specify information disclosed***];]**

   [*or***]**

   [That [*name of plaintiff***] [provided information to/testified before] a public body that was conducting an investigation, hearing, or inquiry;]**

   [*or***]**

   [That [*name of plaintiff***] refused to [***specify activity in which plaintiff refused to participate***];]**

3. **[That [***name of plaintiff***] had reasonable cause to believe that the information disclosed [a violation of a [state/federal] statute/[a violation of/noncompliance with] a [local/state/federal] rule or regulation];]**

   [*or***]**

   [That [*name of plaintiff***] had reasonable cause to believe that the [information provided to/testimony before] the public body disclosed [a violation of a [state/federal] statute/[a violation of/noncompliance with] a [local/state/federal] rule or regulation];]**

   [*or***]**

   [That [*name of plaintiff***]'s participation in [***specify activity***] would result in [a violation of a [state/federal] statute/[a violation of/noncompliance with] a [local/state/federal] rule or regulation];]**

4. **That [***name of defendant***] [discharged/[***other adverse employment action***]] [***name of plaintiff***];**

5. **That [***name of plaintiff***]'s [disclosure of information/refusal to [***specify***]] was a contributing factor in [***name of defendant***]'s decision to [discharge/[***other adverse employment action***]] [***name of plaintiff***];**

6. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

7. **That [***name of defendant***]'s conduct was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

[The disclosure of policies that an employee believes to be merely unwise, wasteful, gross misconduct, or the like, is not protected. Instead, [*name of plaintiff***] must have reasonably believed that [***name of defendant***]'s policies violated federal, state, or local statutes, rules, or regulations.]**

[It is not [*name of plaintiff***]'s motivation for [his/her] disclosure, but only the content of that disclosure, that determines whether the disclosure is protected.]**

[A disclosure is protected even though disclosing the information may be part of [*name of plaintiff***]'s job duties.]**

New December 2012; Revised June 2013, December 2013, Revoked June 2014; Restored and Revised December 2014; Renumbered from CACI No. 2730 and Revised June 2015

Directions for Use

The whistleblower protection statute of the Labor Code prohibits retaliation against an employee who, or whose family member, discloses information about, or refuses to participate in, an illegal activity. (Lab. Code, § 1102.5(b), (c), (h).) Liability may be predicated on retaliation by "any person acting on behalf of the employer." (Lab. Code, § 1102.5(a)−(d).) Modifications to the instruction may be required if liability is predicated on an agency theory and the agent is also a defendant. Modifications will also be required if the retaliation is against a family member of the person who engaged in the protected activity.

Select the first option for elements 2 and 3 for disclosure of information; select the second options for providing information to or testifying before a public body conducting an investigation, hearing, or inquiry. Select the third options for refusal to participate in an unlawful activity. In the first option for element 2, choose "might disclose" if the allegation is that the employer believed that the employee might disclose the information in the future. (Cf. *Rope v. Auto-Chlor System of Washington, Inc.* (2013) 220 Cal.App.4th 635, 648−649 [163 Cal.Rptr.3d 392] [under prior version of statute, no liability for anticipatory or preemptive retaliation based on fear that plaintiff might file a complaint in the future].)

Select any of the optional paragraphs explaining what disclosures are and are not protected as appropriate to the facts of the case. It has been held that a report of publicly known facts is not a protected disclosure. (*Mize-Kurzman v. Marin Community College Dist.* (2012) 202 Cal.App.4th 832, 858 [136 Cal.Rptr.3d 259].) Another court, however, has cast doubt on this limitation and held that protection is not limited to the first public employee to report unlawful acts to the employer. (*Hager v. County of Los Angeles* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1538, 1548−1553 [176 Cal.Rptr.3d 268]; see Lab. Code, § 1102.5(e).)

"Adverse employment action" is viewed the same as it is under the Fair Employment and Housing Act. (*Patten v. Grant Joint Union High School Dist.* (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 1378, 1387 [37 Cal.Rptr.3d 113]; see CACI No. 2505, *Retaliation—Essential Factual Elements*.) Element 4 may be modified to allege constructive discharge or adverse acts that might not be obviously prejudicial. See CACI No. 2509, *"Adverse Employment Action" Explained,* and CACI No. 2510, *"Constructive Discharge" Explained,* for

instructions that may be adapted for use with this instruction.

The employee must demonstrate by a preponderance of evidence that a protected activity was a contributing factor in the adverse action against the employee. The employer may then attempt to prove by clear and convincing evidence that the action would have been taken anyway for legitimate, independent reasons even if the employee had not engaged in the protected activities. (See Lab. Code, § 1102.6; CACI No. 4604, *Affirmative Defense—Same Decision*.)

Sources and Authority

- Retaliation Against Whistleblower Prohibited. Labor Code section 1102.5.
- Affirmative Defense: Same Decision. Labor Code section 1102.6.
- "The elements of a section 1102.5(b) retaliation cause of action require that (1) the plaintiff establish a prima facie case of retaliation, (2) the defendant provide a legitimate, nonretaliatory explanation for its acts, and (3) the plaintiff show this explanation is merely a pretext for the retaliation. [¶] We are concerned here with the first element of a section 1102.5(b) retaliation claim, establishing a prima facie case of retaliation. To do that, a plaintiff must show (1) she engaged in a protected activity, (2) her employer subjected her to an adverse employment action, and (3) there is a causal link between the two." (*Patten, supra,* 134 Cal.App.4th at p. 1384, internal citations omitted.)
- "In 1984, our Legislature provided 'whistle-blower' protection in section 1102.5, subdivision (b), stating that an employer may not retaliate against an employee for disclosing a violation of state or federal regulation to a governmental or law enforcement agency. This provision reflects the broad public policy interest in encouraging workplace whistle-blowers to report unlawful acts without fearing retaliation. Section 1102.5, subdivision (b), concerns employees who report to public agencies. It does not protect plaintiff, who reported his suspicions directly to his employer. Nonetheless, it does show the Legislature's interest in encouraging employees to report workplace activity that may violate important public policies that the Legislature has stated. The state's whistle-blower statute includes administrative regulations as a policy source for reporting an employer's wrongful acts and grants employees protection against retaliatory termination. Thus, our Legislature believes that fundamental public policies embodied in regulations are sufficiently important to justify encouraging employees to challenge employers who ignore those policies." (*Green v. Ralee Engineering Co.* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 66, 76–77 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 16, 960 P.2d 1046].)
- "[T]he purpose of … section 1102.5(b) 'is to 'encourag[e] workplace whistle-blowers to report unlawful acts without fearing retaliation.' " (*Diego v. Pilgrim United Church of Christ* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 913, 923 [180 Cal.Rptr.3d 359].)
- "As a general proposition, we conclude the court could properly craft instructions in conformity with law developed in federal cases interpreting the federal whistleblower statute. As the court acknowledged, it was not bound by such federal interpretations. Nevertheless, the court could properly conclude that the jury required guidance as to what did and did not constitute 'disclosing

information' or a 'protected disclosure' under the California statutes." (*Mize-Kurzman, supra,* 202 Cal.App.4th at p. 847.)

- "The court erred in failing to distinguish between the disclosure of policies that plaintiff believed to be unwise, wasteful, gross misconduct or the like, which are subject to the [debatable differences of opinion concerning policy matters] limitation, and the disclosure of policies that plaintiff reasonably believed violated federal or state statutes, rules, or regulations, which are not subject to this limitation, even if these policies were also claimed to be unwise, wasteful or to constitute gross misconduct." (*Mize-Kurzman, supra,* 202 Cal.App.4th at pp. 852–853.)

- "[I]t is not the *motive* of the asserted whistleblower, but the nature of the communication that determines whether it is covered." (*Mize-Kurzman, supra,* 202 Cal.App.4th at p. 852, original italics.)

- "[I]f we interpret section 1102.5 to require an employee to go to a different public agency or directly to a law enforcement agency before he or she can be assured of protection from retaliation, we would be encouraging public employees who suspected wrongdoing to do nothing at all. Under the scenario envisioned by the [defendant], if the employee reports his or her suspicions to the agency, … , he or she will *have to suffer any retaliatory* conduct with no legal recourse. If the employee reports suspicions to an outside agency or law enforcement personnel, he or she risks subjecting the agency to negative publicity and loss of public support which could ensue without regard to whether the charges prove to be true. At the same time, a serious rift in the employment relationship will have occurred because the employee did not go through official channels within the agency which was prepared to investigate the charges. We see no reason to interpret the statute to create such anomalous results." (*Gardenhire v. Housing Authority* (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 236, 243 [101 Cal.Rptr.2d 893].)

- "Labor Code section 1102.5, subdivision (b) protects employee reports of unlawful activity by third parties such as contractors and employees, as well unlawful activity by an employer. In support of our conclusion, we note that an employer may have a financial motive to suppress reports of illegal conduct by employees and contractors that reflect poorly on that employer." (*McVeigh v. Recology San Francisco* (2013) 213 Cal.App.4th 443, 471 [152 Cal.Rptr.3d 595], internal citation omitted.)

- "We are persuaded that [instructing the jury that reporting publicly known facts is not a protected disclosure] was a proper limitation on what constitutes disclosure protected by California law." (*Mize-Kurzman, supra,* 202 Cal.App.4th at p. 858.)

- "The report of 'publicly known' information or 'already known' information is distinct from a rule in which only the first employee to report or disclose unlawful conduct is entitled to protection from whistleblower retaliation." (*Hager, supra,* 228 Cal.App.4th at p. 1552.)

- "Protection only to the first employee to disclose unlawful acts would defeat the legislative purpose of protecting workplace whistleblowers, as employees would not come forward to report unlawful conduct for fear that someone else already had done so. The 'first report' rule would discourage whistleblowing. Thus, the [defendant]'s interpretation is a disincentive to report

unlawful conduct. We see no such reason to interpret the statute in a manner that would contradict the purpose of the statute." (*Hager, supra,* 228 Cal.App.4th at p. 1550.)

- "Matters such as transferring employees, writing up employees, and counseling employees are personnel matters. 'To exalt these exclusively internal personnel disclosures with whistleblower status would create all sorts of mischief. Most damagingly, it would thrust the judiciary into micromanaging employment practices and create a legion of undeserving protected 'whistleblowers' arising from the routine workings and communications of the job site. … ' " (*Mueller v. County of Los Angeles* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 809, 822 [98 Cal.Rptr.3d 281].)

Secondary Sources

3 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Agency and Employment, § 349

Chin et al., California Practice Guide: Employment Litigation, Ch. 5-L, *Employment Torts And Related Claims: Other Statutory Claims*, ¶ 5:894 et seq. (The Rutter Group)

4 Wilcox, California Employment Law, Ch. 60, *Liability for Wrongful Termination and Discipline*, § 60.03[2][c] (Matthew Bender)

11 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 249, *Employment Law: Termination and Discipline*, §§ 250.12, 249.15 (Matthew Bender)

10 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 100, *Public Entities and Officers: False Claims Actions*, § 100.42 et seq. (Matthew Bender)

4606. Whistleblower Protection—Unsafe Patient Care and Conditions ─Essential Factual Elements (Health & Saf. Code, § 1278.5)

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] discriminated against [him/her] in retaliation for [his/her] [***briefly specify protected conduct***] regarding unsafe patient care, services, or conditions at [***specify hospital or other health care facility***], [***name of defendant***]'s health care facility. In order to establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was [a/an] [patient/employee/member of the medical staff/***specify other health care worker***] of [***name of defendant***];**

2. **[That [***name of plaintiff***] [***select one or both of the following options:***]**

   a. **[presented a grievance, complaint, or report to [[***name of defendant***]/an entity or agency responsible for accrediting or evaluating [***name of defendant***]/[***name of defendant***]'s medical staff/ [or] a governmental entity]] related to, the quality of care, services, or conditions at [***name of defendant***]'s health care facility;]**

   [or]

   b. **[initiated, participated, or cooperated in an [investigation [or] administrative proceeding] related to, the quality of care, services, or conditions at [***name of defendant***]'s health care facility that was carried out by [an entity or agency responsible for accrediting or evaluating the facility/its medical staff/a governmental entity];]**

3. **That [***name of defendant***] [mistreated/discharged/[***other adverse action***]] [***name of plaintiff***];**

4. **That [***name of plaintiff***]'s [***specify***] was a substantial motivating reason for [***name of defendant***]'s [mistreatment/discharge/[***other adverse action***]] of [***name of plaintiff***];**

5. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

6. **That [***name of defendant***]'s conduct was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

New June 2016

Directions for Use

A patient, employee, member of the medical staff, or any other health care worker of a health facility is protected from discrimination or retaliation if he or she, or his or her family member, takes specified acts regarding suspected unsafe patient care and conditions at a health care facility. (Health & Saf. Code, § 1278.5.) A person alleging discrimination or retaliation by the facility has a private right of action against the facility. (*Fahlen v. Sutter Central Valley Hospitals* (2014) 58 Cal.4th 655, 676 [168 Cal.Rptr.3d 165,

318 P.3d 833].)

For elements 3 and 4, choose "mistreated" and "mistreatment" if the plaintiff was a patient. Choose "discharge" or specify another adverse action if the plaintiff is or was an employee, member of the medical staff, or other health care worker of the defendant's facility. Other adverse actions include, but are not limited to, demotion, suspension, or any unfavorable changes in, or breach of, the terms or conditions of the plaintiff's contract, employment, or privileges, or the threat of any of these actions. (Health & Saf. Code, § 1278.5(d)(2).)

Sources and Authority

- Whistleblower Protection for Patients and Health Care Personnel. Health and Safety Code section 1278.5.

- "Section 1278.5 declares a policy of encouraging workers in a health care facility, including members of a hospital's medical staff, to report unsafe patient care. The statute implements this policy by forbidding a health care facility to retaliate or discriminate 'in any manner' against such a worker 'because' he or she engaged in such whistleblower action. It entitles the worker to prove a statutory violation, and to obtain appropriate relief, in a civil suit before a judicial fact finder." (*Fahlen, supra,* 58 Cal.4th at pp. 660−661; internal citation omitted.)

- "A medical staff member who has suffered retaliatory discrimination 'shall be entitled' to redress, including, as appropriate, reinstatement and reimbursement of resulting lost income. Section 1278.5 does not affirmatively state that these remedies may be pursued by means of a civil action, but it necessarily assumes as much when it explains certain procedures that may apply when 'the member of the medical staff … has filed *an action pursuant to this section … ' .*" (*Fahlen, supra,* 58 Cal.4th at p. 676, original italics, internal citation omitted.)

- "[Defendant] also appears to contend that it was entitled to judgment as a matter of law on [plaintiff]'s claim for violation of Health and Safety Code section 1278.5 because the undisputed evidence established that [defendant] terminated [plaintiff] for refusing to perform nurse-led stress testing, rather than for making complaints concerning [defendant]'s nurse-led stress testing. We are not persuaded. In light of the evidence of [plaintiff]'s complaints pertaining to the legality of nurse-led stress testing and the disciplinary actions discussed above, a jury could reasonably find that [defendant] retaliated against her for making these complaints. This is particularly so given that many of the complaints and disciplinary actions occurred within 120 days of each other, thereby triggering the rebuttable presumption of discrimination established in Health and Safety Code section 1278.5, subdivision (d)(1)." (*Nosal-Tabor v. Sharp Chula Vista Medical Center* (2015) 239 Cal.App.4th 1224, 1246 [191 Cal.Rptr.3d 651].)

Secondary Sources

5018. Audio or Video Recording and Transcription

A [sound/video] recording has been admitted into evidence, and a transcription of the recording has been provided to you. The recording itself, not the transcription, is the evidence. The transcription is not an official court reporter's transcript. The transcription was prepared by a party only for the purpose of assisting the jury in following the video-audio recording. The transcription may not be completely accurate. It may contain errors, omissions, or notations of inaudible portions of the recording. Therefore, you should use the transcription only as a guide to help you in following along with the recording. If there is a discrepancy between your understanding of the recording and the transcription, your understanding of the recording must prevail.

[[Portions of the recording have been deleted.] [The transcription [also] contains strikeouts or other deletions.] You must disregard any deleted portions of the recording or transcription and must not speculate as to why there are deletions or guess what might have been said or done.]

[For the video deposition(s) of [*name(s) of deponent(s)***], the transcript of the court reporter is the official record that you should consider as evidence.]**

New December 2010; Revised June 2016

Directions for Use

Give this instruction if an audio or a video recording was played at trial and accepted into evidence. A transcription is created by a party or parties in the case to assist the jury in following the video/audio recording. Include the second paragraph if only a portion of the recording was received into evidence or if parts of the transcription have been redacted. Give the last paragraph if a transcript of a deposition was provided to the jury. (See Code Civ. Proc., § 2025.510(g); see also CACI No. 208, *Deposition as Substantive Evidence*.)

Sources and Authority

- Electronic Recordings of Deposition. Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 2.1040.
- "Defendant contends the trial court erred in permitting the prosecution to provide the jury with a written transcript of the tape recording, because the transcript was not properly authenticated as an accurate rendition of the tape recording. [¶] Following the testimony of [witness] during the prosecution's case-in-chief, the prosecutor proposed to play the tape recording to the jury. Defense counsel suggested the jury should be informed that portions of the tape recording were unintelligible. When the trial court observed that a transcript of the tape recording would be submitted to the jury, defense counsel voiced concern that the jury would follow the transcript rather than independently consider the tape recording. The trial court indicated it would listen to the tape recording and, in the event the court determined that the transcript would assist the jury in its understanding of the interview, a copy of the transcript would be provided to the jury at the

time of its deliberations. … The trial court instructed the jury that in the event there was any discrepancy between the jury's understanding of the tape recording and the typed transcript, the jury's understanding of the recording should control." (*People v. Sims* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 405, 448 [20 Cal.Rptr.2d 537, 853 P.2d 992], internal citation omitted.)

- " 'To be admissible, tape recordings need not be completely intelligible for the entire conversation as long as enough is intelligible to be relevant without creating an inference of speculation or unfairness.' [¶] Thus, partially unintelligible tape is admissible unless the audible portions of the tape are so incomplete the tape's relevance is destroyed. The fact a tape recording 'may not be clear in its entirety does not of itself require its exclusion from evidence since a witness may testify to part of a conversation if that is all he heard and it appears to be intelligible.' " (*People v. Polk* (1996) 47 Cal.App.4th 944, 952–953 [54 Cal.Rptr.2d 921], internal citations omitted.)

- "[T]ranscripts of admissible tape recordings are only prejudicial if it is shown they are so inaccurate that the jury might be misled into convicting an innocent man." (*Polk, supra,* 47 Cal.App.4th at p. 955.)

- "During closing arguments all counsel cautioned the jury the transcript was only a guide and to just listen to the tape. Before the jury left to deliberate, the court again instructed it to disregard the transcript and sent that instruction into the jury room. We presume the jurors followed the court's instructions regarding the tape and the use of the transcript." (*People v. Brown* (1990) 225 Cal.App.3d 585, 598 [275 Cal.Rptr. 268].)

Secondary Sources

3 Witkin, California Evidence (5th ed. 2012) Presentation at Trial, § 162

5 California Trial Guide, Unit 100, *The Oral Deposition*, § 100.27 (Matthew Bender)

16 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions*, §§ 193.70 et seq., 193.172 (Matthew Bender)

California Judges Benchbook: Civil Proceedings—Trial (2d ed.) § 7.23 (Cal CJER 2010)