

Admin.

February 3, 2011

Memorandum 2011-1

2010-2011 Annual Report (Staff Draft)

Attached to this memorandum is a staff draft of the text of the Commission's *2010-2011 Annual Report*. In the interest of saving photocopying and mailing costs, we have not reproduced here the various tables and appendices that are published with the Annual Report (e.g., text of Commission's governing statute, cumulative table of legislative action on Commission recommendations, revised Comments to legislation enacted during session, etc.). After approval of the text of the Annual Report, the staff will assemble the various parts and send the Annual Report to the printer.

Much of the report's content is routine and does not change significantly from year to year. A few matters requiring special attention are noted below.

Personnel of Commission

The report reflects the appointments of Mark Dundee and Stephen Murphy as Commissioners on July 8, 2010, the end of Ali Jahangiri's service as Commissioner on September 9, 2010, and the appointment of Damian Capozzola as Commissioner on December 13, 2010.

Activities of Commission Members and Staff

The report typically notes any activities of Commission members and staff related to the Commission's work, such as speeches made and articles published during the past year. See p. 27. **Please notify the staff if you have any activities of this nature to report.**

Revised Comment Report

When the Commission submits a recommendation to the Legislature, it appends to each code section that would be affected by the recommendation an official Comment that briefly states the section's derivation and effect. When a

Any California Law Revision Commission document referred to in this memorandum can be obtained from the Commission. Recent materials can be downloaded from the Commission's website (www.clrc.ca.gov). Other materials can be obtained by contacting the Commission's staff, through the website or otherwise.

bill that would implement a Commission recommendation is thereafter amended in the legislative process, it is sometimes necessary for the Commission to revise an official Comment, to reflect the effect of the amendment. Those Comment revisions are memorialized in a supplemental report that is reproduced in an appendix in the next issued Annual Report.

This Annual Report will contain four such appendices, reproducing revised Comments previously approved by the Commission relating to Commission recommendations that were implemented in 2010. In one of those appendices, relating to the Commission's recommendation on *Nonsubstantive Reorganization of Deadly Weapon Statutes*, the staff recommends a further minor revision of one of the Comments that is to be reproduced, in order to more precisely identify the derivation of a new statutory provision:

Penal Code § 16650. "Handgun ammunition"

16650. (a) As used in this part, "handgun ammunition" means ammunition principally for use in pistols, revolvers, and other firearms capable of being concealed upon the person, notwithstanding that the ammunition may also be used in some rifles.

(b) As used in Section 30312 and in Article 3 (commencing with Section 30345) of Chapter 1 of Division 10 of Title 4, "handgun ammunition" does not include either of the following:

(1) Ammunition designed and intended to be used in an antique firearm.

(2) Blanks.

Comment. Subdivision (a) of Section 16650 continues the first clause of former Section 12060(b), the first clause of former Section 12318(b)(2), and former Section 12323(a) without substantive change.

Subdivision (b) continues the remainder of former Section 12060(b) (except the definition of "antique firearm") and the remainder of former Section 12318(b)(2) (except the definition of "antique firearm") without substantive change.

See Sections 16170 ("antique firearm"), 16520 ("firearm"), 16530 ("firearm capable of being concealed upon the person," "pistol," and "revolver").

Does the Commission approve this revision?

Editorial Suggestions

If you have any editorial suggestions relating to the draft, please be sure to inform the staff.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Cohen
Staff Counsel

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION

STAFF DRAFT

2010-2011 Annual Report

California Law Revision Commission
4000 Middlefield Road, Room D-2
Palo Alto, CA 94303-4739
www.clrc.ca.gov

Cite this report as *2010-2011 Annual Report*, 40 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 1 (2010).

SUMMARY OF WORK OF COMMISSION

Recommendations to the 2010 Legislature

In 2010, bills effectuating four Commission recommendations were enacted, relating to the following subjects:

- Nonsubstantive reorganization of deadly weapon statutes
- Reorganization of mechanics lien law
- Donative transfer restrictions
- Trial court restructuring

Recommendations to the 2011 Legislature

In 2011, the Commission expects that the Legislature will consider new legislation recommended by the Commission on the following subjects:

- Statutory clarification and simplification of CID law
- Trial court restructuring
- Record notice of option to purchase real property
- Nonsubstantive reorganization of deadly weapon statutes (clean-up legislation)
- Reorganization of mechanics lien law (clean-up legislation)
- Obsolete cross-references to former Code of Civil Procedure Section 116.780(d)

Commission Activities Planned for 2011

During 2011, the Commission intends to work on the following major topics: charter schools and the Government Claims Act, commercial and industrial common interest developments, Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act (UAGPPJA), trial court restructuring, deadly weapons clean-up legislation, and enforcement of family protections and creditor claims against nonprobate assets. The Commission will work on other topics as time permits.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
2010-2011 ANNUAL REPORT	9
Introduction	9
2011 Legislative Program	10
Major Studies in Progress	10
Charter Schools and the Government Claims Act	11
Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act (UAGPPJA)	11
Common Interest Developments	11
Trial Court Restructuring	11
Deadly Weapons Clean-up Legislation	12
Enforcement of Family Protections and Creditor Claims Against Nonprobate Assets	12
Other Subjects	12
Calendar of Topics for Study	12
Function and Procedure of Commission	12
Background Studies	14
Recommendations	14
Official Comments	16
Commission Materials as Legislative History	16
Use of Commission Materials To Determine Legislative Intent	18
Publications	22
Electronic Publication and Internet Access	23
Electronic Mail	23
MCLE Credit	24
Personnel of Commission	24
Commission Budget	26

Other Activities27

 National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform
 State Laws27

 Other Staff Activities27

Legislative History of Recommendations in the 2010
 Legislative Session28

 Deadly Weapons28

 Mechanics Lien Law28

 Donative Transfer Restrictions28

 Trial Court Restructuring29

Report on Statutes Repealed by Implication or Held
 Unconstitutional29

Recommendations30

APPENDICES

1. Statute Governing the California Law Revision
 Commission__

2. Calendar of Topics Authorized for Study__

3. Report of the California Law Revision Commission
 on Chapter 178 of the Statutes of 2010 (Senate
 Bill 1115)__

4. Report of the California Law Revision Commission
 on Chapter 620 of the Statutes of 2010 (Senate
 Bill 105)__

5. Report of the California Law Revision Commission
 on Chapter 697 of the Statutes of 2010 (Senate
 Bill 189)__

6. Report of the California Law Revision Commission
 on Chapter 711 of the Statutes of 2010 (Senate
 Bill 1080)__

7. Legislative Action on Commission Recommendations
 (Cumulative)__

8. Commission Publications__

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION

4000 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD, ROOM D-2
PALO ALTO, CA 94303-4739
650-494-1335

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE JOHN ZEBROWSKI (RET.), Chairperson
STEPHEN MURPHY, Vice-Chairperson
DIANE F. BOYER-VINE
SENATOR ELLEN CORBETT
DAMIAN CAPOZZOLA
MARK DUNDEE
SIDNEY GREATHOUSE
PAMELA L. HEMMINGER
SUSAN DUNCAN LEE

February 10, 2011

To: The Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor of California, and
The Legislature of California

In conformity with Government Code Section 8293, the California Law Revision Commission submits this report of its activities during 2010 and its plans for 2011.

Each of the four Commission recommendations considered by the Legislature in 2010 were enacted into law, in whole or in substantial part.

The Commission is grateful to the members of the Legislature who carried Commission-recommended legislation in 2010:

- Senator Alan Lowenthal (Mechanics Lien Law)
- Senator Tom Harman (Donative Transfer Restrictions)
- Senate Public Safety Committee (Deadly Weapons Statutes)
- Assembly Judiciary Committee (Trial Court Restructuring)

The Commission held five one-day meetings in 2010, and one two-day meeting. Meetings were held in Sacramento and Burbank.

Respectfully submitted,

Associate Justice John Zebrowski (ret.)
Chairperson

2010-2011 ANNUAL REPORT

Introduction

The California Law Revision Commission was created in 1953 and commenced operation in 1954 as the permanent successor to the Code Commission,¹ with responsibility for a continuing substantive review of California statutory and decisional law.² The Commission studies the law to discover defects and anachronisms and recommends legislation to make needed reforms.

The Commission ordinarily works on major topics, assigned by the Legislature, that require detailed study and cannot easily be handled in the ordinary legislative process. The Commission's work is independent, nonpartisan, and objective.

The Commission consists of:³

- A Member of the Senate appointed by the Rules Committee
- A Member of the Assembly appointed by the Speaker
- Seven members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate
- The Legislative Counsel, who is an ex officio member

The Commission may study only topics that the Legislature has authorized.⁴

1. See 1953 Cal. Stat. ch. 1445, operative September 9, 1953. The first meeting of the Commission was held on February 23, 1954.

6. See Gov't Code §§ 8280-8298 (statute establishing Law Revision Commission) (Appendix 1 *infra*). See also *1955 Report* [Annual Report for 1954] at 7, 1 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports (1957).

3. For current membership, see "Personnel of Commission" *infra*.

4. Under its general authority, the Commission may study only topics that the Legislature, by concurrent resolution, authorizes for study. See *Calendar of Topics Authorized for Study*, Appendix 2 *infra*. However, the Commission may study and recommend revisions to correct technical or minor substantive defects in state statutes without a prior concurrent resolution. Gov't Code § 8298. Additionally, a concurrent resolution or statute may directly confer authority to study a particular subject. See, e.g., 2006 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 128 [ACR 73] (nonsubstantive reorganization of weapon statutes); 2006 Cal. Stat. ch. 216 [AB 2034] (donative transfer restrictions).

The Commission has submitted 389 recommendations to the Legislature, of which 357 (more than 90%) have been enacted in whole or in substantial part.⁵ Commission recommendations have resulted in the enactment of legislation affecting 24,303 sections of California law: 4,793 sections amended, 10,652 sections added, and 8,868 sections repealed.

The Commission's recommendations, reports, and other selected materials are published in softcover and later collected in hardcover volumes. Recent materials are also available through the Internet. A list of past publications and information on obtaining printed or electronic versions are at the end of this Annual Report.⁶

2011 Legislative Program

In 2011, the Commission plans to seek the introduction of legislation effectuating Commission recommendations on the following subjects:

- Statutory clarification and simplification of CID law
- Trial court restructuring
- Record notice of option to purchase real property
- Nonsubstantive reorganization of deadly weapon statutes (clean-up legislation)
- Reorganization of mechanics lien law (clean-up legislation)
- Obsolete cross-references to former Code of Civil Procedure Section 116.780(d)

Major Studies in Progress

During 2011, the Commission intends to work on the following major topics: charter schools and the Government Claims Act, commercial and industrial common interest developments, Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act (UAGPPJA), trial court restructuring, deadly

5. See *Legislative Action on Commission Recommendations*, Appendix 7 *infra*.

6. See *Commission Publications*, Appendix 8 *infra*.

weapons clean-up legislation, and enforcement of family protections and creditor claims against nonprobate assets. To the extent time permits, the Commission will also consider other subjects.

Charter Schools and the Government Claims Act

The Legislature has authorized the Commission to analyze “the legal and policy implications of treating a charter school as a public entity for the purposes of Division 3.6 (commencing with Section 810) of Title 1 of the Government Code” (i.e., the Government Claims Act).⁷ The Commission began work on this study in December 2009.

Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act (UAGPPJA)

The Commission will study whether the Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act (UAGPPJA) should be adopted in California, and, if so, in what form it should be adopted.

Common Interest Developments

The Commission is actively studying the application of the Davis-Stirling Common Interest Development Act (Civ. Code §§ 1350-1378) to commercial and industrial CIDs. The study should be completed in 2011.

The Commission may study other matters relating to CIDs as time permits.

Trial Court Restructuring

The Commission will continue its work to identify and study statutes made obsolete as a result of trial court unification, the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act (1997 Cal. Stat. ch. 850), and the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act (2000 Cal. Stat. ch. 1010).

7. 2009 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 98 (ACR 49 (Evans)).

Deadly Weapons Clean-up Legislation

The Commission will prepare clean-up legislation necessary to fully implement its recommendation on *Nonsubstantive Reorganization of Deadly Weapon Statutes*, 38 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 217 (2009).

Enforcement of Family Protections and Creditor Claims Against Nonprobate Assets

The Commission will study the status of creditor claims and family protections with respect to a decedent's assets that pass outside the probate system.

Other Subjects

The major studies in progress described above will dominate the Commission's time and resources during 2011. As time permits, the Commission will consider other subjects authorized for study.

Calendar of Topics for Study

The Commission's calendar includes 22 topics authorized by the Legislature for study.⁸

Function and Procedure of Commission

The principal duties of the Commission are to:⁹

- (1) Examine the common law and statutes for the purpose of discovering defects and anachronisms.
- (2) Receive and consider suggestions and proposed changes in the law from the American Law Institute, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws,¹⁰ bar associations, and other learned bodies, and from judges, public officials, lawyers, and the public generally.

8. See *Calendar of Topics Authorized for Study*, Appendix 2 *infra*.

9. Gov't Code §§ 8280-8298 (statute governing California Law Revision Commission). See Appendix 1 *infra*.

10. The Legislative Counsel, an ex officio member of the Law Revision Commission, serves as a Commissioner of the Commission on Uniform State Laws. See Gov't Code § 8261.

- (3) Recommend such changes in the law as it deems necessary to bring California law into harmony with modern conditions.¹¹

The Commission is required to file a report at each regular session of the Legislature containing a calendar of topics selected by it for study, listing both studies in progress and topics intended for future consideration. Under its general authority, the Commission may study only topics that the Legislature, by concurrent resolution, authorizes for study.¹² However, the Commission may study and recommend revisions to correct technical or minor substantive defects in state statutes without a prior concurrent resolution.¹³ Additionally, a concurrent resolution¹⁴ or statute¹⁵ may directly confer authority to study a particular subject.

11. Gov't Code § 8289. The Commission is also directed to recommend the express repeal of all statutes repealed by implication, or held unconstitutional by the California Supreme Court or the United States Supreme Court. Gov't Code § 8290. See "Report on Statutes Repealed by Implication or Held Unconstitutional" *infra*.

12. Gov't Code § 8293. Section 8293 requires a concurrent resolution authorizing the Commission to study topics contained in the calendar of topics set forth in the Commission's regular report to the Legislature. Section 8293 also requires that the Commission study any topic that the Legislature by concurrent resolution or statute refers to the Commission for study.

13. Gov't Code § 8298.

14. For an example of a concurrent resolution referring a specific topic to the Commission for study, see 2006 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 128 [ACR 73] (nonsubstantive reorganization of weapon statutes).

15. For example, Code of Civil Procedure Section 703.120(a) requires the Commission to review statutes providing for exemptions from enforcement of money judgments every 10 years and to recommend any needed revisions. The Commission also has continuing statutory authority to study enforcement of judgments pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 703.120(b).

Government Code Section 70219 requires the Commission, in consultation with the Judicial Council, to perform follow-up studies taking into consideration the experience in courts that have unified. For a list of specific studies, see *Trial Court Unification: Revision of Codes*, 28 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 51, 82-86 (1998).

Government Code Section 71674 requires the Commission to recommend repeal of provisions made obsolete by the Trial Court Employment Protection

Background Studies

The Commission's work on a recommendation typically begins after a background study has been prepared. The background study may be prepared by a member of the Commission's staff or by a specialist in the field who is retained as a consultant.¹⁶ Law professors and practicing attorneys who serve as consultants have already acquired the considerable knowledge necessary to understand the specific problems under consideration, and receive little more than an honorarium for their services. From time to time, expert consultants are also retained to advise the Commission at meetings.

Recommendations

After making its preliminary decisions on a subject, the Commission ordinarily distributes a tentative recommendation to interested persons and organizations, including the State Bar, local and specialized bar associations, public interest organizations, and business and professional associations. Notice of the availability of the tentative recommendation is mailed to interested persons on the Commission's mailing list and publicized in legal newspapers and other relevant publications. Notice is also posted on the Commission's website and emailed to interested persons.

Comments received on the tentative recommendation are considered by the Commission in determining what

and Governance Act (Gov't Code § 71600 *et seq.*), Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 (1997 Cal. Stat. ch. 850), and the implementation of trial court unification.

Statutory authority may be uncodified. See, e.g., 2005 Cal. Stat. ch. 422 (beneficiary deeds).

16. The following persons are presently under contract as Commission consultants, or have served in that capacity on presently active studies: James E. Acret, Pacific Palisades; Professor Susan F. French, UCLA Law School; Prof. Edward C. Halbach, Jr., Berkeley; Keith Honda, Monterey; Gordon Hunt, Hunt Ortmann; Professor J. Clark Kelso, McGeorge School of Law; Professor Miguel A. Méndez, Stanford Law School; Nathaniel Sterling, former Executive Secretary, California Law Revision Commission, Palo Alto; Professor Gregory S. Weber, McGeorge School of Law.

recommendation, if any, will be made to the Legislature.¹⁷ When the Commission has reached a conclusion on the matter,¹⁸ its recommendation to the Legislature (including a draft of any necessary legislation) is published and distributed in printed form and on the Internet. If a background study has been prepared in connection with the recommendation, it may be published by the Commission or in a law review.¹⁹

17. For a step-by-step description of the procedure followed by the Commission in preparing the 1963 governmental liability statute, see DeMouly, *Fact Finding for Legislation: A Case Study*, 50 A.B.A. J. 285 (1964). The procedure followed in preparing the Evidence Code is described in 7 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 3 (1965). See also Gaal, *Evidence Legislation in California*, 36 S.W.U. L. Rev. 561, 563-69 (2008); Quillinan, *The Role and Procedures of the California Law Revision Commission in Probate and Trust Law Changes*, 8 Est. Plan. & Cal. Prob. Rep. 130-31 (Cal. Cont. Ed. Bar 1987).

18. Occasionally, one or more members of the Commission may not join in all or part of a recommendation submitted to the Legislature by the Commission. Dissents are noted in the minutes of the meeting at which the recommendation is approved.

19. For recent background studies published in law reviews, see Méndez, *California Evidence Code - Federal Rules of Evidence, IX. General Provisions*, 44 U.S.F. L. Rev. 891 (2010); Méndez, *California Evidence Code - Federal Rules of Evidence, VIII. Judicial Notice*, 44 U.S.F. L. Rev. 141 (2009); Méndez, *California Evidence Code - Federal Rules of Evidence, VII. Relevance: Definition and Limitations*, 42 U.S.F. L. Rev. 329 (2007); Méndez, *California Evidence Code - Federal Rules of Evidence, VI. Authentication and the Best and Secondary Evidence Rules*, 41 U.S.F. L. Rev. 1 (2006); Méndez, *California Evidence Code - Federal Rules of Evidence, V. Witnesses: Conforming the California Evidence Code to the Federal Rules of Evidence*, 39 U.S.F. L. Rev. 455 (2005); Alford, *Report to Law Revision Commission Regarding Recommendations for Changes to California Arbitration Law*, 4 Pepp. Disp. Resol. L.J. 1 (2004); Méndez, *California Evidence Code - Federal Rules of Evidence, IV. Presumptions and Burden of Proof: Conforming the California Evidence Code to the Federal Rules of Evidence*, 38 U.S.F. L. Rev. 139 (2003); Méndez, *California Evidence Code - Federal Rules of Evidence, I. Hearsay and Its Exceptions: Conforming the Evidence Code to the Federal Rules*, 37 U.S.F. L. Rev. 351 (2003); Méndez, *California Evidence Code - Federal Rules of Evidence, II. Expert Testimony and the Opinion Rule: Conforming the Evidence Code to the Federal Rules*, 37 U.S.F. L. Rev. 411 (2003); Méndez, *California Evidence Code - Federal Rules of Evidence, III. The Role of Judge and Jury: Conforming the Evidence Code to the Federal Rules*, 37 U.S.F. L. Rev. 1003 (2003); Tung, *After Orange County: Reforming California Municipal Bankruptcy Law*, 53 Hastings L.J. 885 (2002); Weber, *Potential Innovations in*

Official Comments

The Commission ordinarily prepares an official Comment explaining each section it recommends for enactment, amendment, or repeal. The Comments are included in the Commission's published recommendations. A Comment indicates the derivation of a section and often explains its purpose, its relation to other law, and potential issues concerning its meaning or application.²⁰

Commission Materials as Legislative History

Commission recommendations are printed and sent to both houses of the Legislature, as well as to the Legislative Counsel and Governor.²¹ Receipt of a recommendation by the Legislature is noted in the legislative journals, and the recommendation is referred to the appropriate policy committee.²²

The bill introduced to effectuate a Commission recommendation is assigned to legislative committees charged with study of the matter in depth.²³ A copy of the recommendation is provided to

Civil Discovery: Lessons for California from the State and Federal Courts, 32 McGeorge L. Rev. 1051 (2001).

For a list of background studies published in law reviews before 2000, see 10 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 1108 n.5 (1971); 11 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 1008 n.5, 1108 n.5 (1973); 13 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 1628 n.5 (1976); 16 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 2021 n.6 (1982); 17 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 819 n.6 (1984); 18 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 212 n.17, 1713 n.20 (1986); 19 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 513 n.22 (1988); 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 198 n.16 (1990); 32 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 585 n.14 (2002).

20. Commission Comments are published by LexisNexis and Thomson/West in their print and CD-ROM editions of the annotated codes, and printed in selected codes prepared by other publishers. Comments are also available on Westlaw and LexisNexis.

21. See Gov't Code §§ 8291, 9795, 11094-11099; see also *Reynolds v. Superior Court*, 12 Cal. 3d 834, 847 n.18, 528 P.2d 45, 53 n.18, 117 Cal. Rptr. 437, 445 n.18 (1974) (Commission "submitted to the Governor and the Legislature an elaborate and thoroughly researched study").

22. See, e.g., Senate J. Aug. 18, 2003, at 2031 (noting receipt of 2002-2003 recommendations and their transmittal to the Committee on Judiciary).

23. See, e.g., Office of Chief Clerk, California State Assembly, California's Legislature 126-27 (2000) (discussing purpose and function of legislative committee system).

legislative committee members and staff before the bill is heard and throughout the legislative process. The legislative committees rely on the recommendation in analyzing the bill and making recommendations to the Legislature concerning it.²⁴

If an amendment is made to the bill that renders one of the Commission's original Comments inconsistent, the Commission generally will adopt a revised Comment and provide it to the committee. The Commission also provides this material to the Governor's office once the bill has passed the Legislature and is before the Governor for action. These materials are a matter of public record.

Until the mid-1980s, a legislative committee, on approving a bill implementing a Commission recommendation, would adopt the Commission's recommendation as indicative of the committee's intent in approving the bill.²⁵ If a Comment required revision, the revised Comment would be adopted as a legislative committee Comment. The committee's report would be printed in the journal of the relevant house.²⁶

The Legislature has discontinued the former practice due to increased committee workloads and an effort to decrease the volume of material reprinted in the legislative journals. Under

24. The Commission does not concur with the suggestion of the court in *Conservatorship of Wendland*, 26 Cal. 4th 519, 542, 28 P.3d 151, 166, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 412, 430 (2001), that a Commission Comment might be entitled to less weight based on speculation that the Legislature may not have read and endorsed every statement in the Commission's report. That suggestion belies the operation of the committee system in the Legislature. See White, *Sources of Legislative Intent in California*, 3 Pac. L.J. 63, 85 (1972) ("The best evidence of legislative intent must surely be the records of the legislature itself and the reports which the committees relied on in recommending passage of the legislation.").

25. See, e.g., *Baldwin v. State*, 6 Cal. 3d 424, 433, 491 P.2d 1121, 1126, 99 Cal. Rptr. 145, 150 (1972). For a description of legislative committee reports adopted in connection with the bill that became the Evidence Code, see *Arellano v. Moreno*, 33 Cal. App. 3d 877, 884, 109 Cal. Rptr. 421, 426 (1973).

26. For an example of such a report, see *Report of Senate Committee on Judiciary on Assembly Bill 3472*, Senate J. June 14, 1984, reprinted in 18 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 1, 115 (1986).

current practice, a legislative committee relies on Commission materials in its analysis of a bill, but does not separately adopt the materials. Instead, the Commission makes a report detailing the legislative history of the bill, including any revised Comments. Bill reports are published as appendices to the Commission's annual reports.²⁷

Use of Commission Materials To Determine Legislative Intent

Commission materials that have been placed before and considered by the Legislature are legislative history, are declarative of legislative intent,²⁸ and are entitled to great weight in construing statutes.²⁹ The materials are a key interpretive aid for

27. Commission reports have in the past been published as well in the legislative journals. See, e.g., *In re Marriage of Neal*, 153 Cal. App. 3d 117, 124, 200 Cal. Rptr. 341, 345 (1984) (noting that Chairman of Senate Judiciary Committee, when reporting on AB 26 on Senate floor, moved that revised Commission report be printed in Senate Journal as evidence of legislative intent).

28. See, e.g., *Fair v. Bakhtiari*, 40 Cal. 4th 189, 195, 147 P.3d 653, 657, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 871, 875 (2006) ("The Commission's official comments are deemed to express the Legislature's intent."); *People v. Williams*, 16 Cal. 3d 663, 667-68, 547 P.2d 1000, 128 Cal. Rptr. 888 (1976) ("The official comments of the California Law Revision Commission on the various sections of the Evidence Code are declarative of the intent not only of the draft[ers] of the code but also of the legislators who subsequently enacted it.").

29. See, e.g., *Dep't of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Bd.*, 40 Cal. 4th 1, 12-13 n.9, 145 P.3d 462, 469 n.9, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 585, 593 n.9 (2006) (Commission's official comments are persuasive evidence of Legislature's intent); *Hale v. S. Cal. IPA Med. Group, Inc.*, 86 Cal. App. 4th 919, 927, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 773, 778 (2001):

In an effort to discern legislative intent, an appellate court is entitled to take judicial notice of the various legislative materials, including committee reports, underlying the enactment of a statute. (*Kern v. County of Imperial* (1990) 226 Cal.App.3d 391, 400, fn. 8 [276 Cal. Rptr. 524]; *Coopers & Lybrand v. Superior Court* (1989) 212 Cal.App.3d 524, 535, fn. 7 [260 Cal. Rptr. 713].) In particular, reports and interpretive opinions of the Law Revision Commission are entitled to great weight. (*Schmidt v. Southern Cal. Rapid Transit Dist.* (1993) 14 Cal.App.4th 23, 30, fn. 10 [17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 340].)

practitioners as well as courts,³⁰ and courts may judicially notice and rely on them.³¹ Courts at all levels of the state³² and federal³³ judicial systems depend on Commission materials to construe statutes enacted on Commission recommendation.³⁴ Appellate

30. Cf. 7 B. Witkin, Summary of California Law *Constitutional Law* § 123, at 230 (10th ed. 2005) (Commission reports as aid to construction); Gaylord, *An Approach to Statutory Construction*, 5 Sw. U. L. Rev. 349, 384 (1973).

31. See, e.g., *Kaufman & Broad Communities, Inc. v. Performance Plastering, Inc.*, 133 Cal. App. 4th 26, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 520 (2005) (providing overview of materials that may be judicially noticed in determining legislative intent); *Hale*, 86 Cal. App. 4th at 927; *Barkley v. City of Blue Lake*, 18 Cal. App. 4th 1745, 1751 n.3, 23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 315, 318-19 n.3 (1993).

32. See, e.g., *Sullivan v. Delta Air Lines, Inc.*, 15 Cal. 4th 288, 298, 935 P.2d 781, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 74 (1997) (California Supreme Court); *Admin. Mgmt Services, Inc. v. Fid. Deposit Co. of Md.*, 129 Cal. App. 3d 484, 488, 181 Cal. Rptr. 141 (1982) (court of appeal); *Rossetto v. Barross*, 90 Cal. App. 4th Supp. 1, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 255 (2001) (appellate division of superior court).

33. See, e.g., *California v. Green*, 399 U.S. 149, 154 n.3 (1970) (United States Supreme Court); *S. Cal. Bank v. Zimmerman (In re Hilde)*, 120 F.3d 950, 953 (9th Cir. 1997) (federal court of appeals); *Williams v. Townsend*, 283 F. Supp. 580, 582 (C.D. Cal. 1968) (federal district court); *Ford Consumer Fin. Co. v. McDonell (In re McDonell)*, 204 B.R. 976, 978-79 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1996) (bankruptcy appellate panel); *In re Garrido*, 43 B.R. 289, 292-93 (Bankr. S.D. Cal. 1984) (bankruptcy court).

34. See, e.g., *Jevne v. Superior Court*, 35 Cal. 4th 935, 947, 111 P.3d 954, 962, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 685, 694-95 (2005) (Commission report entitled to substantial weight in construing statute); *Collection Bureau of San Jose v. Rumsey*, 24 Cal. 4th 301, 308 & n.6, 6 P.3d 713, 718 & n.6, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 792, 797 & n.6 (2000) (Comments to reenacted statute reiterate the clear understanding and intent of original enactment); *Brian W. v. Superior Court*, 20 Cal. 3d 618, 623, 574 P.2d 788, 791, 143 Cal. Rptr. 717, 720 (1978) (Comments persuasive evidence of Legislature's intent); *Volkswagen Pac., Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 7 Cal. 3d 48, 61-63, 496 P.2d 1237, 1247-48, 101 Cal. Rptr. 869, 879-80 (1972) (Comments evidence clear legislative intent of law); *Van Arsdale v. Hollinger*, 68 Cal. 2d 245, 249-50, 437 P.2d 508, 511, 66 Cal. Rptr. 20, 23 (1968) (Comments entitled to substantial weight), overruled on other grounds by *Privette v. Superior Court*, 5 Cal. 4th 689, 854 P.2d 721, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 72 (1993); *County of Los Angeles v. Superior Court*, 62 Cal. 2d 839, 843-44, 402 P.2d 868, 870-71, 44 Cal. Rptr. 796, 798-99 (1965) (statutes reflect policy recommended by Commission).

courts alone have cited Commission materials in several thousand published opinions.³⁵

Commission materials have been used as direct support for a court's interpretation of a statute,³⁶ as one of several indicia of legislative intent,³⁷ to explain the public policy behind a statute,³⁸ and on occasion to demonstrate (by their silence) the Legislature's intention not to change the law.³⁹ The Legislature's failure to adopt a Commission recommendation may be used as evidence of legislative intent to reject the proposed rule.⁴⁰

Commission materials are entitled to great weight, but they are not conclusive.⁴¹ While the Commission endeavors in Comments to explain any changes in the law made by a section, the Commission does not claim that every consistent or inconsistent

35. In this connection it should be noted that the Law Revision Commission should not be cited as the "Law Revision Committee" or as the "Law Review Commission." See, e.g., *Venerable v. City of Sacramento*, 185 F. Supp. 2d 1128, 1132 (E.D. Cal. 2002) (Law Revision "Committee"); *Ryan v. Garcia*, 27 Cal. App. 4th 1006, 1010 n.2, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 158, 160 n.2 (1994) (Law "Review" Commission).

36. See, e.g., *People v. Ainsworth*, 45 Cal. 3d 984, 1015, 755 P.2d 1017, 1036, 248 Cal. Rptr. 568, 586 (1988).

37. See, e.g., *Heieck & Moran v. City of Modesto*, 64 Cal. 2d 229, 233 n.3, 411 P.2d 105, 108 n.3, 49 Cal. Rptr. 377, 380 n.3 (1966).

38. See, e.g., *Southern Cal. Gas Co. v. Public Utils. Comm'n*, 50 Cal. 3d 31, 38 n.8, 784 P.2d 1373, 1376 n.8, 265 Cal. Rptr. 801, 804 n.8 (1990).

39. See, e.g., *State ex rel. State Pub. Works Bd. v. Stevenson*, 5 Cal. App. 3d 60, 64-65, 84 Cal. Rptr. 742, 745-46 (1970) (finding that Legislature had no intention of changing existing law where "not a word" in Commission's reports indicated intent to abolish or emasculate well-settled rule).

40. See, e.g., *Nestle v. City of Santa Monica*, 6 Cal. 3d 920, 935-36, 496 P.2d 480, 490, 101 Cal. Rptr. 568, 578 (1972).

41. See, e.g., *Redevelopment Agency v. Metropolitan Theatres Corp.*, 215 Cal. App. 3d 808, 812, 263 Cal. Rptr. 637, 639 (1989) (Comment does not override clear and unambiguous statute). Commission materials are but one indicium of legislative intent. See, e.g., *Estate of Joseph*, 17 Cal. 4th 203, 216, 949 P.2d 472, 480, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 619, 627 (1998). The accuracy of a Comment may also be questioned. See, e.g., *Buzgheia v. Leasco Sierra Grove*, 30 Cal. App. 4th 766, 774, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 144, 149 (1994); *In re Thomas*, 102 B.R. 199, 202 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1989).

case is noted in the Comments,⁴² nor can it anticipate judicial conclusions as to the significance of existing case authorities.⁴³ Hence, failure of the Comment to note every change the recommendation would make in prior law, or to refer to a consistent or inconsistent judicial decision, is not intended to, and should not, influence the construction of a clearly stated statutory provision.⁴⁴

Some types of Commission materials may not properly be relied on as evidence of legislative intent. Courts have on occasion cited preliminary Commission materials such as tentative recommendations, correspondence, and staff memoranda and drafts in support of their construction of a statute.⁴⁵ While these materials may be indicative of the Commission's intent in proposing the legislation, only the Legislature's intent in adopting

42. *Cf.* *People v. Coleman*, 8 Cal. App. 3d 722, 731, 87 Cal. Rptr. 554, 559 (1970) (Comments make clear intent to reflect existing law even if not all supporting cases are cited).

43. See, e.g., *Arellano v. Moreno*, 33 Cal. App. 3d 877, 885, 109 Cal. Rptr. 421, 426-27 (1973) (noting that decisional law cited in Comment was distinguished by the California Supreme Court in a case decided after enactment of the Commission recommendation).

44. The Commission does not concur in the *Kaplan* approach to statutory construction. See *Kaplan v. Superior Court*, 6 Cal. 3d 150, 158-59, 491 P.2d 1, 5-6, 98 Cal. Rptr. 649, 653-54 (1971). For a reaction to the problem created by the *Kaplan* approach, see *Recommendation Relating to Erroneously Ordered Disclosure of Privileged Information*, 11 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 1163 (1973); 1974 Cal. Stat. ch. 227.

45. See, e.g., *Rojas v. Superior Court*, 33 Cal. 4th 407, 93 P.3d 260, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 643 (2005) (tentative recommendation, correspondence, and staff memorandum and draft); *Yamaha Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization*, 19 Cal. 4th 1, 12-13, 960 P.2d 1031, 1037, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 7 (1998) (tentative recommendation). However, in some cases, proposed legislation will be based on a tentative, rather than final, Commission recommendation. See, e.g., *Estate of Archer*, 193 Cal. App. 3d 238, 243, 239 Cal. Rptr. 137, 140 (1987). In that event, reliance on the tentative recommendation is proper.

See also *Ilkchooyi v. Best*, 37 Cal. App. 4th 395, 406, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 766, 772-73 (1995) (letter responding to tentative recommendation); D. Henke, *California Legal Research Handbook* § 3.51 (1971) (background studies).

the legislation is entitled to weight in construing the statute.⁴⁶ Unless preliminary Commission materials were placed before the Legislature during its consideration of the legislation, those materials are not legislative history and are not relevant in determining the Legislature's intention in adopting the legislation.⁴⁷

A Commission study prepared after enactment of a statute that analyzes the statute is not part of the legislative history of the statute.⁴⁸ However, documents prepared by or for the Commission may be used by the courts for their analytical value, apart from their role in statutory construction.⁴⁹

Publications

Commission publications are distributed to the Governor, the Secretary of the Senate, the Chief Clerk of the Assembly, and the Legislative Counsel.⁵⁰ Commission materials are also distributed to

46. *Cf. Rittenhouse v. Superior Court*, 235 Cal. App. 3d 1584, 1589, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 595, 598 (1991) (linking Commission's intent and Legislature's intent); *Guthman v. Moss*, 150 Cal. App. 3d 501, 508, 198 Cal. Rptr. 54, 58 (1984) (determination of Commission's intent used to infer Legislature's intent).

47. The Commission concurs with the opinion of the court in *Juran v. Epstein*, 23 Cal. App. 4th 882, 894 n.5, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 588, 594 n.5 (1994), that staff memoranda to the Commission should not be considered as legislative history.

48. See, e.g., *Duarte v. Chino Community Hosp.*, 72 Cal. App. 4th 849, 856 n.3, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 521, 525 n.3 (1999).

49. See, e.g., *Sierra Club v. San Joaquin Local Agency Formation Comm'n*, 21 Cal. 4th 489, 502-03, 981 P.2d 543, 551-52, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 702, 712 (1999) (unenacted Commission recommendation useful as "opinion of a learned panel"); *Hall v. Hall*, 222 Cal. App. 3d 578, 585, 271 Cal. Rptr. 773, 777 (1990) (Commission staff report most detailed analysis of statute available); *W.E.J. v. Superior Court*, 100 Cal. App. 3d 303, 309-10, 160 Cal. Rptr. 862, 866 (1979) (law review article prepared for Commission provides insight into development of law); *Schonfeld v. City of Vallejo*, 50 Cal. App. 3d 401, 407 n.4, 123 Cal. Rptr. 669, 673 n.4 (1975) (court indebted to many studies of Commission for analytical materials).

50. See Gov't Code § 8291. For limitations on Section 8291, see Gov't Code §§ 9795, 11094-11099.

interest groups, lawyers, law professors, courts, district attorneys, law libraries, and other individuals requesting materials.

The Commission's reports, recommendations, and studies are republished in hardcover volumes that serve as a permanent record of the Commission's work and, it is believed, are a valuable contribution to the legal literature of California. These volumes are available at many county law libraries and at some other libraries. About half of the hardcover volumes are out of print, but others are available for purchase.⁵¹ Publications that are out of print are available as electronic files.⁵²

Electronic Publication and Internet Access

Since 1995, the Commission has provided a variety of information on the Internet, including online material and downloadable files.⁵³ Interested persons with Internet access can find the current agenda, meeting minutes, background studies, tentative and final recommendations, staff memoranda, and general background information.

Since 2002, all Commission publications and staff memoranda are available as electronic files. Recent publications and memoranda may be downloaded from the Commission's website. Files that are not on the website are available on request.⁵⁴

Electronic Mail

Email commenting on Commission proposals or suggesting issues for study is given the same consideration as letter correspondence, if the email message includes the name and regular mailing address of the sender. Email to the Commission may be sent to *commission@clrc.ca.gov*.

The Commission distributes the majority of its meeting agendas, staff memoranda, and other written materials electronically, by means of its website and email distribution lists. The Commission

51. See *Commission Publications*, Appendix 8 *infra*.

52. See "Electronic Publication and Internet Access" *infra*.

53. The URL for the Commission's website is <<http://www.clrc.ca.gov>>.

54. See *Commission Publications*, Appendix 8 *infra*.

encourages use of email as an inexpensive and expedient means of communication with the Commission.

MCLE Credit

The Commission is approved by the State Bar of California as a minimum continuing legal education provider. Participants and attendees at Commission meetings may be eligible to receive MCLE credit. To receive credit for participation or attendance at a meeting, a person must register at the meeting. Meeting materials are available free of charge on the Internet⁵⁵ or may be purchased in advance from the Commission.

Personnel of Commission

As of February 10, 2011, the following persons were members of the Law Revision Commission:

Legislative Members⁵⁶

Senator Ellen Corbett, San Leandro

55. See “Electronic Publication and Internet Access” *supra*.

56. The Senate and Assembly members of the Commission serve at the pleasure of their respective appointing powers, the Senate Committee on Rules and the Speaker of the Assembly. Gov’t Code § 8281.

Members Appointed by Governor⁵⁷

	<i>Term Expires</i>
Justice John Zebrowski (ret.), Glendale <i>Chairperson</i>	October 1, 2011
Stephen Murphy, Dixon <i>Vice Chairperson</i>	October 1, 2013
Damian Capozzola, Hermosa Beach	October 1, 2013
Mark Dundee, La Cañada Flintridge	October 1, 2013
Sidney Greathouse, Calabasas Hills	October 1, 2011
Pamela L. Hemminger, Los Angeles	October 1, 2011
Susan Duncan Lee, San Francisco	October 1, 2011

Legislative Counsel⁵⁸

Diane F. Boyer-Vine, Sacramento

Effective September 1, 2010, the Commission elected Associate Justice John Zebrowski (ret.) as Chairperson (succeeding Susan Duncan Lee), and Stephen Murphy as Vice Chairperson (succeeding Associate Justice John Zebrowski (ret.)). The terms of the new officers end August 31, 2011.

On July 8, 2010, the Governor appointed Mark Dundee of La Cañada Flintridge and Stephen Murphy of Dixon as Commissioners, to terms ending on October 1, 2013, filling the vacant seats of former Commissioners Frank Kaplan and William Weinberger.

On September 9, 2010, Commissioner Ali Jahangiri ended his service as Commissioner.

On December 13, 2010, the Governor appointed Damian Capozzola of Hermosa Beach as a Commissioner, to a term ending

57. Seven Commission members are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. Gov't Code § 8281. These Commissioners serve staggered four-year terms. *Id.* The provision in Government Code Section 8281 to the effect that Commission members appointed by the Governor hold office until the appointment and qualification of their successors has been superseded by the rule in Government Code Section 1774 declaring a vacancy if there is no reappointment 60 days following expiration of the term of office. See also Gov't Code § 1774.7 (Section 1774 overrides contrary special rules unless specifically excepted).

58. The Legislative Counsel serves on the Commission by virtue of office. Gov't Code § 8281.

on October 1, 2013, filling the vacant seat of former Commissioner Ali Jahangiri.

The following persons are on the Commission's staff:

Legal

BRIAN HEBERT
Executive Director

BARBARA S. GAAL
Chief Deputy Counsel

STEVE COHEN
Staff Counsel

Administrative-Secretarial

DEBORA LARRABEE
*Associate Governmental
Program Analyst*

VICTORIA V. MATIAS
Secretary

During the latter half of 2010, Michael Lew, a recent graduate of the University of Michigan School of Law, served as a law clerk for the Commission, and Jennifer Maguire, a student at the University of California Davis School of Law, served as an extern.

In October 2010, Cindy Dole completed a one-year fellowship with the Commission.

In December 2010, Catherine Bidart resigned her position as a staff counsel with the Commission. The Commission greatly appreciates Ms. Bidart's four years of diligent and excellent work.

Commission Budget

The Commission's operations for the 2010-11 fiscal year have been funded through reimbursements from the California Legislature. The amount appropriated to the Commission is \$667,000.

The Commission's general fund allocation is supplemented by \$15,000 budgeted for income generated from sale of documents to the public, representing reimbursement for the production and shipping cost of the documents.

The Commission also receives substantial donations of necessary library materials from the legal publishing community,

especially California Continuing Education of the Bar, LexisNexis, and Thomson/West. In addition, the Commission receives benchbooks from the California Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER). The Commission receives additional library materials from other legal publishers and from other law reform agencies on an exchange basis, and has full access to the University of California Davis School of Law Library and the Stanford University Law Library. The Commission is grateful for these contributions.

Other Activities

The Commission is directed by statute to cooperate with bar associations and other learned, professional, or scientific associations, institutions, or foundations in any manner suitable for the fulfillment of the purposes of the Commission.⁵⁹

National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws

The Commission is directed by statute to receive and consider proposed changes in the law recommended by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.⁶⁰ Legislative Counsel and Commission member Diane F. Boyer-Vine is a member of the California Commission on Uniform State Laws and the National Conference. The Commission's Executive Secretary, Brian Hebert, is an associate member of the National Conference.

Other Staff Activities

In 2010, the Chief Deputy Counsel continued to participate in meetings of the Judicial Council's Small Civil Cases Working Group (as the California Law Revision Commission Liaison to that group). The group's work led to the enactment of Assembly Bill 2284 (Evans), 2010 Cal. stat. ch. 674, which establishes an expedited jury trial ("EJT") procedure for use in California.

59. Gov't Code § 8296.

60. Gov't Code § 8289.

Legislative History of Recommendations in the 2010 Legislative Session

Four Commission recommendations were enacted, in whole or in part, in 2010.

Deadly Weapons

Senate Bills 1080 (2010 Cal. Stat. ch. 711) and 1115 (2010 Cal. Stat. ch. 178) were introduced by the Senate Public Safety Committee to effectuate the Commission's recommendation on *Nonsubstantive Reorganization of Deadly Weapon Statutes*, 38 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 217 (2008). Senate Bill 1080 was enacted, with amendments; Senate Bill 1115 was enacted as introduced. See *Report of the California Law Revision Commission on Chapter 178 of the Statutes of 2010 (Senate Bill 1115)*, 40 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports ____ (2010) (Appendix 3 *infra*); *Report of the California Law Revision Commission on Chapter 711 of the Statutes of 2010 (Senate Bill 1080)*, 40 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports ____ (2010) (Appendix 6 *infra*).

Mechanics Lien Law

Senate Bill 189 (2010 Cal. Stat. ch. 697) was introduced in 2009 by Senator Alan Lowenthal to effectuate the Commission's recommendation on *Mechanics Lien Law*, 37 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 527 (2007). The measure was enacted, with amendments. See *Report of the California Law Revision Commission on Chapter 697 of the Statutes of 2010 (Senate Bill 189)*, 40 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports ____ (2010) (Appendix 5 *infra*).

Donative Transfer Restrictions

Senate Bill 105 (2010 Cal. Stat. ch. 620) was introduced in 2009 by Senator Tom Harman to effectuate the Commission's recommendation on *Donative Transfer Restrictions*, 38 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 107 (2008). The measure was enacted, with amendments. See *Report of the California Law Revision Commission on Chapter 620 of the Statutes of 2010 (Senate Bill 105)*, 40 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports ____ (2010) (Appendix 4 *infra*).

Trial Court Restructuring

Assembly Bill 2767 (2010 Cal. Stat. ch. 212) was introduced by the Assembly Judiciary Committee to, among other things, effectuate most of the Commission's recommendation on *Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring: Part 5*, 39 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports ___ (2009). The measure was enacted, with amendments.

Report on Statutes Repealed by Implication or Held Unconstitutional

Government Code Section 8290 provides:

The commission shall recommend the express repeal of all statutes repealed by implication, or held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the state or the Supreme Court of the United States.

Pursuant to this directive, the Commission has reviewed the decisions of the United States Supreme Court and the California Supreme Court published since the Commission's last Annual Report was prepared⁶¹ and has the following to report:

- No decision holding a state statute repealed by implication has been found.
- No decision of the United States Supreme Court holding a state statute unconstitutional has been found.
- No decision of the California Supreme Court holding a state statute unconstitutional has been found.⁶²

61. This study has been carried through opinions published on or before October 25, 2010.

62. Two decisions of the California Supreme Court imposed constitutional qualifications on the application of a state statute.

In *People v. Engram*, 50 Cal. 4th 1131, 240 P.3d 237, 116 Cal. Rptr. 3d 762 (2010), the court held that Penal Code Section 1050, a statute generally directing trial courts to give criminal cases precedence over civil cases, would violate constitutional provisions relating to separation-of-powers, and the obligation of a court to provide for fair administration of justice, if it were applied so as to

Recommendations

The Commission respectfully recommends that the Legislature authorize the Commission to continue its study of the topics previously authorized.⁶³

compel a trial court to forgo or abandon consideration of all civil cases or proceedings over an extended period of time.

In *People v. Kelly*, 47 Cal. 4th 1008, 222 P.3d 186, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 733 (2010), the court held that Health & Safety Code Section 11362.77 is an invalid amendment of the voter-adopted Compassionate Use Act (Health & Safety Code § 11362.5), under article II, section 10, subdivision (c) of the California Constitution, to the extent that the section is applied so as to burden a defense available under the Compassionate Use Act.

63. See *Calendar of Topics Authorized for Study*, Appendix 2 *infra*.