

CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION

TENTATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Trial Court Restructuring Clean-Up: Completion of Studies Under Government Code Section 70219

July 2020

The purpose of this tentative recommendation is to solicit public comment on the Commission's tentative conclusions. A comment submitted to the Commission will be part of the public record. The Commission will consider the comment at a public meeting when the Commission determines what, if any, recommendation it will make to the Legislature. It is just as important to advise the Commission that you approve the tentative recommendation as it is to advise the Commission that you believe revisions should be made to it.

COMMENTS ON THIS TENTATIVE RECOMMENDATION SHOULD BE RECEIVED BY THE COMMISSION NOT LATER THAN September 1, 2020.

The Commission will often substantially revise a proposal in response to comment it receives. Thus, this tentative recommendation is not necessarily the recommendation the Commission will submit to the Legislature.

California Law Revision Commission
c/o UC Davis School of Law
Davis, CA 95616
<commission@clrc.ca.gov>

SUMMARY OF TENTATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Government Code Section 70219 directs the Judicial Council and the Law Revision Commission to undertake certain studies relating to judicial administration. The Judicial Council and the Commission have completed those studies as assigned. Section 70219 is thus obsolete and the Commission recommends that it be repealed.

This tentative recommendation was prepared pursuant to Government Code Section 71674 and Resolution Chapter 158 of the Statutes of 2018.

TRIAL COURT RESTRUCTURING CLEAN-UP:
COMPLETION OF STUDIES UNDER
GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 70219

1 In its 1998 report on revision of the codes to implement trial court unification, the Law
2 Revision Commission identified a number of topics for future study.¹ The Legislature
3 subsequently enacted Government Code Section 70219, which directs the Judicial
4 Council and the Commission to undertake those studies and share responsibility for them
5 in the manner suggested in the Commission’s report.²

6 The Judicial Council and the Commission conducted the assigned studies as directed
7 and all of the work is complete. Section 70219 thus appears to be obsolete and ready for
8 repeal, as explained in more detail below.

9 **Assigned Studies and Work Performed**

10 The studies assigned by Section 70219 fall into the following categories:

- 11 • A reexamination of the three-track system for civil cases, to be jointly
12 conducted by the Judicial Council and the Commission.
- 13 • Studies primarily assigned to the Judicial Council, to conduct in consultation
14 with the Commission.
- 15 • Studies primarily assigned to the Commission, to conduct in consultation
16 with the Judicial Council.

17 Each category is described and discussed in order.

18 ***Joint Study of the Three-Track System for Civil Cases***

19 In its report on revision of the codes to implement trial court unification, the
20 Commission sought to preserve existing procedural distinctions between traditional

1. See *Trial Court Unification: Revision of Codes*, 28 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 51 (1998) (hereafter, “TCU: Revision of Codes”). The Commission prepared that recommendation pursuant to 1997 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 102.

2. Government Code Section 70219 provides:

70219. On submission by the California Law Revision Commission of its report to the Governor and the Legislature pursuant to Resolution Chapter 102 of the Statutes of 1997 recommending statutory changes that may be necessitated by court unification, *the Judicial Council and the California Law Revision Commission shall study and make recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature on the issues identified in the report as appropriate for future study*, including consideration of the experience in counties in which the courts have unified. *Each agency shall assume primary or joint responsibility for the studies and recommendations as outlined in the report*, and each agency shall consult with the other in the studies and recommendations. This section does not limit any authority of the Judicial Council or the California Law Revision Commission to conduct studies and make recommendations authorized or directed by law.

(Emphasis added.) This provision was first enacted in 1998. See 1998 Cal. Stat. ch. 931, § 257. It was inadvertently repealed by 2001 Cal. Stat. ch. 745, § 113, but reenacted without substantive change by 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 784, § 340. See Gov’t Code § 70219 Comment (2002).

1 superior court cases (now known as unlimited civil cases), traditional municipal court
2 cases (now known as limited civil cases), and small claims cases (a special category of
3 limited civil cases).³ The Commission “strongly recommended,” however, that the
4 Legislature “direct a study reexamining this three-track system and its underlying policies
5 in light of unification.”⁴

6 The Commission explained that such a study “may entail elimination of unnecessary
7 procedural distinctions, reassessment of the jurisdictional limits for small claims
8 procedures and economic litigation procedures, and reevaluation of which procedures
9 apply to which type of case.”⁵ The Commission recommended that this study be jointly
10 conducted by the Judicial Council and the Commission.⁶

11 By enacting Section 70219, the Legislature approved that approach. The section
12 specifically directs the Judicial Council and the Commission to conduct the studies
13 identified in the Commission’s report, assume primary or joint responsibility for those
14 studies as outlined in that report, and consult with each other in conducting the assigned
15 studies.⁷

16 As directed, the Judicial Council and the Commission jointly reexamined the three-
17 track system for civil cases. In particular, they conducted a project in which they
18 identified and proposed to eliminate some unnecessary procedural differences between
19 limited civil cases and unlimited civil cases.⁸ The proposed legislation was enacted.⁹

20 The Judicial Council and the Commission also jointly studied the jurisdictional limits
21 for a small claims case and a limited civil case. As a first step, the Judicial Council hired
22 a consulting firm to conduct empirical research and prepare a background study
23 summarizing its findings. Upon consideration of the consultant’s 2002 report,¹⁰ the
24 Commission prepared and widely circulated a tentative recommendation proposing to
25 increase the jurisdictional limits for both types of cases.¹¹ The Commission received
26 extensive input, but consensus among the stakeholders proved difficult to reach and work
27 on the joint study stopped in early 2004.¹²

3. See *TCU: Revision of Codes*, *supra* note 1, at 64-65, 82.

4. *Id.* at 82.

5. *Id.* at 82-83.

6. *Id.* at 83.

7. For the text of Section 70219, see *supra* note 2.

8. See *Unnecessary Procedural Differences Between Limited and Unlimited Civil Cases*, 30 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 443 (2000).

9. See Cal. Stat. ch. 812.

10. Policy Studies, Inc., *Report on the California Three-Track Civil Litigation Study* (July 31, 2002).

11. See Tentative Recommendation on *Jurisdictional Limits of Small Claims Cases and Limited Civil Cases* (Dec. 2002).

12. See CLRC Staff Memorandum 2004-3; First Supplement to CLRC Staff Memorandum 2004-3; CLRC Staff Memorandum 2004-40; CLRC Minutes (Feb. 2004), pp. 7-8; see also CLRC Staff Memorandum 2014-41, p. 9 (explaining that project was tabled a decade earlier, circumstances warranting reactivation of the project had not materialized, and “it seems reasonable to consider the matter closed.”).

1 Several bills modifying the jurisdictional limits for a small claims case have since been
2 enacted.¹³ The joint study by the Judicial Council and the Commission helped pave the
3 way for those bills and related improvements (such as reforms relating to temporary
4 judges, self-represented litigants, and litigants who do not speak English).¹⁴ The Judicial
5 Council took positions on and helped to shape the jurisdictional bills,¹⁵ but the
6 Commission stayed on the sidelines as required by its governing statute.¹⁶

7 The jurisdictional limit for a limited civil case remains unchanged.¹⁷ Although some
8 recent Judicial Council subgroups re-explored the possibility of revising that limit, they
9 did not find sufficient support for such a reform.¹⁸

10 ***Studies Primarily Assigned to the Judicial Council***

11 Under Section 70219, the following studies were primarily assigned to the Judicial
12 Council, to conduct in consultation with the Commission: ¹⁹

13 *Obsolete statutes relating to prior court and personnel restructurings.* The
14 Commission’s 1998 report cited two code sections to illustrate this problem.²⁰ Both of
15 those provisions have since been repealed.²¹

13. See 2005 Cal. Stat. ch. 600 (SB 422 (Simitian)); 2005 Cal. Stat. ch. 618 (AB 1459) (Canciamilla); 2006 Cal. Stat. ch. 150, § 1 (AB 2455 (Nakanishi)); 2008 Cal. Stat. ch. 157, § 4 (SB 1432 (Margett)); 2011 Cal. Stat. ch. 64 (SB 221 (Simitian)).

14. See, e.g., 2005 Cal. Stat. ch. 600, § 1 (legislative findings referring to consultant’s report for joint study); 2005 Cal. Stat. ch. 618, § 1 (same); Assembly Committee on Judiciary Analysis of AB 1459 (April 26, 2005), pp. 5-6 (referring to joint study); Assembly Committee on Judiciary Analysis of SB 411 (June 28, 2005), pp. 5-6 (same); CLRC Staff Memorandum 2004-40 (describing Judicial Council projects addressing concerns expressed in joint study); CLRC Staff Memorandum 2005-41 (discussing 2005 bills and impact of joint study).

15. See, e.g., Senate Committee on Judiciary Analysis of AB 1459 (June 28, 2005), pp. 1, 5-6; Senate Committee on Judiciary Analysis of SB 221 (April 12, 2011), pp. 3-6.

16. See Gov’t Code § 8288; see also CLRC Staff Memorandum 99-85, p. 2 (“The Commission does not take positions on bills; it speaks to the Legislature through its own recommendations and bills.”).

17. See Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86, 86.1.

18. See, e.g., <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/SPR18-11.pdf> (Judicial Council’s invitation to comment on proposal by its Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee to increase jurisdictional limit for limited civil cases from \$25,000 to \$50,000, as recommended by its Commission on Future of California’s Court System); CLRC Staff Memorandum 2011-36, p. 4 & Exhibit p. 1 (describing ideas being explored by Judicial Council’s Small Civil Cases Working Group).

19. See *TCU: Revision of Codes*, *supra* note 1, at 84-85.

20. See *id.* at 84 n.116 (citing Gov’t Code §§ 71003, 71040.5).

21. See 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 784 § 341 (SB 1316 (Committee on Judiciary)) (repealing Gov’t Code § 71003); 2001 Cal. Stat. ch. 824, § 24 (AB 1700 (Steinberg)) (repealing Gov’t Code § 71040.5); see also *Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring: Part I*, 32 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 1, 308-09 (2002) (hereafter, “*TCR: Part I*”) (recommending repeal of article containing Gov’t Code § 71003).

1 *Superior court sessions, both general and special.* The Commission studied and made
2 recommendations on this topic, with input from the Judicial Council and other
3 stakeholders.²² The proposed legislation was enacted.²³

4 *Number of authorized commissioners and referees in a county in which the courts have*
5 *unified.* In 2000, the Judicial Council co-sponsored the enactment of the Trial Court
6 Employment Protection and Governance Act (“TCEPGA”).²⁴ Among other things, this
7 legislation includes a code section that governs appointment of subordinate judicial
8 officers (“SJOs”) after trial court unification.²⁵ Later, the Judicial Council studied the
9 balance between judges and SJOs and made recommendations on conversion of SJO
10 positions to judgeships.²⁶ Legislation on the matter was enacted.²⁷

11 *Reorganization of statutes governing court fees.* The statutes governing court fees were
12 standardized and reorganized through the enactment of the Uniform Civil Fees and
13 Standard Fee Schedule Act of 2005.²⁸ They are now consolidated in a single chapter of
14 the Government Code.²⁹

15 *Eligibility of judges to serve on the small claims advisory committee.* This topic was
16 addressed in a 1999 clean-up bill on trial court unification.³⁰ Among other things, that bill
17 amended the provision governing the composition of the small claims advisory
18 committee.³¹

22. See *Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring: Part 2*, 33 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 169, 175-76 (2003) (hereafter “*TCR: Part 2*”); see also CLRC Staff Memorandum 2001-2, Exhibit pp. 2-3 (AOC memorandum reporting on Judicial Council activities).

23. See 2003 Cal. Stat. ch. 79.

24. 2000 Cal. Stat. ch. 1010.

25. See Gov’t Code § 71622; see also *TCR: Part 1*, *supra* note 20, at 12 (TCEPGA “has established far-reaching provisions relating to subordinate judicial officers that eclipse much of existing law relating to authorization and appointment of subordinate judicial officers.”).

26. See Judicial Council, *Update of the Judicial Workload Assessment and New Methodology for Selecting Courts with Subordinate Judicial Officers for Conversion to Judgeships* (Feb. 23, 2007); Judicial Council, Subordinate Judicial Officer Working Group, *Subordinate Judicial Officers: Duties and Titles* (July 2002).

27. 2007 Cal. Stat. ch. 722, § 3 (AB 159 (Jones)) (adding Section 69615 to Gov’t Code); see also 2010 Cal. Stat. ch. 690, § 2 (AB 2763 (Committee on Judiciary)) (amending Gov’t Code § 69615); <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/csjo.pdf> (summarizing situation).

28. See 2005 Cal. Stat. ch. 75 (AB 145 (Committee on Budget)).

29. See Gov’t Code §§ 70600-70678.

30. See 1999 Cal. Stat. ch. 344, § 5 (SB 210 (Committee on Judiciary)); see also *Trial Court Unification Follow-Up*, 29 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 657, 658 (1999) (Appendix #5 to 1999-2000 Annual Report, 29 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 579 (1999)) (hereafter, “*TCU Follow-Up*”); CLRC Staff Memorandum 2001-2, Exhibit p. 5 (AOC memorandum reporting on Judicial Council activities).

31. See Code Civ. Proc. § 116.950 & Comment.

1 *Catalogue of cases within the appellate jurisdiction of the courts of appeal on June 30,*
2 *1995. With the exception of death penalty cases, the courts of appeal have appellate*
3 *jurisdiction “when superior courts have original jurisdiction in causes of a type within the*
4 *appellate jurisdiction of the courts of appeal on June 30, 1995, and in other causes*
5 *prescribed by statute.”*³² To aid in interpretation of this constitutional requirement, the
6 Commission’s 1998 report raised the possibility of creating a catalogue of the types of
7 cases that were within the appellate jurisdiction of the courts of appeal on June 30,
8 1995.³³

9 As directed by the Legislature, the Judicial Council investigated this topic, in
10 consultation with the Commission.³⁴ In mid-1999, the Appellate Advisory Committee of
11 the Judicial Council concluded that “rather than constructing a catalogue in the abstract, it
12 was best to wait for the issue to be ripe and better defined.”³⁵

13 In 2001, the Commission revisited the concept of creating a catalogue.³⁶ This concept
14 faded from consideration as the Judicial Council and the Commission explored broader
15 ideas relating to appellate and writ review under trial court unification.³⁷

16 The Commission circulated a tentative recommendation on the subject, which proposed
17 a set of constitutional and statutory reforms, including deletion of the constitutional
18 reference to “causes of a type within the appellate jurisdiction of the courts of appeal on
19 June 30, 1995.”³⁸ The Judicial Council’s Ad Hoc Task Force on the Superior Court
20 Appellate Divisions developed its own proposal, which took a different approach.³⁹
21 Neither approach gained traction and the efforts were eventually set aside.⁴⁰

22 The Commission is not aware of any current interest in developing a catalogue of cases
23 within the appellate jurisdiction of the courts of appeal on June 30, 1995. The lack of
24 interest is likely due to the possibility of transferring, rather than dismissing, an appeal
25 brought in the wrong court.⁴¹

32. Cal. Const. art. VI, § 11 (emphasis added).

33. See *TCU: Revision of Codes*, *supra* note 1, at 84.

34. See, e.g., CLRC Staff Memorandum 99-31; First Supplement to CLRC Staff Memorandum 99-31; CLRC Staff Memorandum 99-73; CLRC Minutes (June 1999), p. 11; CLRC Minutes (Oct. 1999), p. 9.

35. CLRC Staff Memorandum 99-73, Exhibit p. 1.

36. See CLRC Staff Memorandum 2001-56, pp. 2-6.

37. See, e.g., materials collected at <http://www.clrc.ca.gov/J1310.html> (CLRC Study J-1310: *Appellate and Writ Review Under Trial Court Unification*).

38. See Tentative Recommendation on *Appellate and Writ Review Under Trial Court Unification* (Nov. 2001).

39. See Ad Hoc Task Force on the Superior Court Appellate Divisions, *Report to the Appellate Process Task Force on the Superior Court Appellate Divisions* (May 2001).

40. See CLRC Minutes (Nov. 2003), p. 8; see also CLRC Staff Memorandum 2003-38.

41. See, e.g., *People v. Nickerson*, 128 Cal. App. 4th 33, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 563 (2005) (ordering transfer of case from court of appeal to appellate division); Gov’t Code § 68915 (“No appeal taken to the Supreme Court or to a court of appeal shall be dismissed for the reason only that the same was not taken to the proper court, but the cause shall be transferred to the proper court upon such terms as to costs or otherwise as may be just, and shall be proceeded with therein, as if regularly appealed thereto.”); see also CLRC Staff

1 *Consolidation of jury commissioner functions for the courts in each county.* The
2 Commission studied and made recommendations on this topic, with input from the
3 Judicial Council and other stakeholders.⁴² The proposed legislation was enacted.⁴³

4 *Magistrate as judicial officer of the state or judicial officer of a particular court.*⁴⁴
5 Statutory clarification of this point was deemed unnecessary.⁴⁵ The Commission is not
6 aware of any current concerns relating to this matter.

7 *Correction of county-specific statutes after unification in that county.* The Commission
8 studied and made recommendations on this topic, with input from the Judicial Council
9 and other stakeholders.⁴⁶ The proposed legislation was enacted.⁴⁷

10 Pursuant to other sources of authority,⁴⁸ the Commission is continuing to review and
11 make recommendations relating to statutes made obsolete by trial court restructuring,
12 including county-specific statutes.⁴⁹ Section 70219's directive to study and correct
13 county-specific statutes is no longer necessary.⁵⁰

14 *Reexamination of the statutes governing jury selection.* The Commission studied and
15 made recommendations on this topic, with input from the Judicial Council and other
16 stakeholders.⁵¹ The proposed legislation was enacted.⁵²

17 ***Studies Primarily Assigned to the Commission***

18 Under Section 70219, the following studies were primarily assigned to the
19 Commission, to conduct in consultation with the Judicial Council:⁵³

Memorandum 2001-56, pp. 5-6 (discussing authority to transfer); CLRC Staff Memorandum 2001-2, Exhibit p. 6 (AOC memorandum reporting existence of consensus that “any problems occurring in this area could be resolved by transfer of an appeal filed in the wrong court to the appropriate court.”).

42. See *TCR: Part 2*, *supra* note 22, at 177-78.

43. See 2003 Cal. Stat. ch. 79.

44. See generally CLRC Staff Memorandum 1997-66, p. 23.

45. See CLRC Staff Memorandum 2001-2, Exhibit pp. 6-7 (AOC memorandum reporting on Judicial Council activities).

46. See *TCR: Part 2*, *supra* note 22, at 177-78.

47. See *TCR: Part 1*, *supra* note 21, at 16-17.

48. See Gov't Code § 71674; 2018 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 158 (item #12).

49. See, e.g., *Statutes Made Obsolete by Trial Court Restructuring (Part 6): Court Facilities*, 46 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 25 (2019); *Trial Court Restructuring Clean-Up: Obsolete References to Marshals*, 46 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 105 (2019).

50. See, e.g., CLRC Staff Memorandum 2001-2, Exhibit pp. 7-8 (AOC memorandum discussing work on county-specific statutes to be done by Commission).

51. See *TCR: Part 1*, *supra* note 21, at 19-20. See also *id.* at 109-13 (proposing to amend Code Civ. Proc. §§ 198.5 & 201 and repeal Code Civ. Proc. §§ 199, 199.2, 199.3 & 199.5).

52. See 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 784 (SB 1316 (Committee on Judiciary)).

53. See *TCU: Revision of Codes*, *supra* note 1, at 85-86.

1 *Obsolete statutes relating to expired pilot projects or other expired programs.* The
2 Commission studied and made recommendations on this topic, with input from the
3 Judicial Council and other stakeholders.⁵⁴ The proposed legislation was enacted.⁵⁵

4 *Whether to conform the statutory provisions on circumstances for appointment of a*
5 *receiver.* The Commission studied and made recommendations on this topic, providing
6 opportunities for stakeholder input.⁵⁶ The proposed legislation was enacted.⁵⁷

7 *Procedure for good faith improver claims.* The Commission studied and made
8 recommendations on this topic, providing opportunities for stakeholder input.⁵⁸ The
9 proposed legislation was enacted.⁵⁹

10 *Procedure for obtaining a stay of a mechanic's lien foreclosure action pending*
11 *arbitration.* The Commission studied this topic and issued a recommendation in 2000.⁶⁰
12 The following year, the proposed legislation was included in a bill with some other
13 reforms,⁶¹ but later deleted to permit further study in light of a new court decision.⁶²

14 Thereafter, the Commission approved a revised recommendation.⁶³ A bill to implement
15 the revised recommendation was introduced in 2003.⁶⁴ To address concerns raised in the
16 legislative process, the bill was amended to implement the substance of the original
17 recommendation instead. It was enacted as so amended.⁶⁵

18 *Clarification of provisions relating to obtaining counsel for a defendant in a criminal*
19 *case.* The Commission's 1998 report pointed out that certain statutes on appointment of
20 counsel for a criminal defendant "appear to be somewhat dated, and their interrelation is
21 unclear."⁶⁶ The report suggested that a "clearer statutory statement of the governing rules
22 may be appropriate."⁶⁷

54. See *Expired Pilot Projects*, 30 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 327 (2000).

55. See 2001 Cal. Stat. ch. 115 (SB 153 (Knight)).

56. See *Authority to Appoint Receivers*, 30 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 291 (2000).

57. See 2001 Cal. Stat. ch. 44 (SB 562 (Morrow)).

58. See *Jurisdictional Classification of Good Faith Improver Claims*, 30 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 281 (2000).

59. See 2000 Cal. Stat. ch. 688, § 7 (AB 1669 (Committee on Judiciary)).

60. See *Stay of Mechanic's Lien Enforcement Pending Arbitration*, 30 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 307 (2000).

61. See SB 562 (Morrow), as introduced on Feb. 22, 2001.

62. See CLRC Staff Memorandum 2001-93.

63. See *Stay of Mechanic's Lien Enforcement Pending Arbitration*, 31 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 333 (2001).

64. See AB 113 (Ackerman), as introduced on Feb.3, 2003.

65. See 2003 Cal. Stat. ch. 22.

66. *TCU: Revision of Codes*, *supra* note 1, at 85 n.128 (referring to Penal Code §§ 859, 859a, 859b, 860).

67. *Id.*

1 Upon further study as directed by the Legislature, the Commission became concerned
2 that some of the statutes might conflict with a defendant’s constitutional right of self-
3 representation.⁶⁸ The Commission decided not to propose legislation in this area, because
4 such a proposal would entail analysis beyond the scope of the technical clean-up
5 originally envisioned when the Legislature authorized the study.⁶⁹

6 *Role of court reporter in a county in which the courts have unified, particularly in a*
7 *criminal case.* Citing several statutes, the Commission’s 1998 report noted that
8 “[e]xisting statutes governing functions of court reporters may be problematic as applied
9 in a county in which the courts have unified, particularly in criminal cases.”⁷⁰ The
10 Commission studied this matter and recommended statutory revisions to address the
11 problems identified.⁷¹ The proposed legislation was enacted.⁷²

12 *Appealability of order of recusal in a criminal case.* The Commission studied and
13 proposed legislation on the appealability of an order of recusal in a criminal case. The
14 proposed legislation was enacted.⁷³

15 *Publication of legal notice in a county with a unified superior court.* The Commission
16 studied and made recommendations on this topic, with input from the Judicial Council
17 and other stakeholders.⁷⁴ The proposed legislation was enacted.⁷⁵

18 *Resolving the numbering conflict in the two Chapters 2.1 (commencing with Section*
19 *68650) of Title 8 of the Government Code.* The Legislature fixed this problem by enacting
20 the 1998 bill on maintenance of the codes.⁷⁶ There was no need for the Commission to do
21 anything further.

68. See CLRC Staff Memorandum 1999-12.

69. See *id.*; see also CLRC Minutes (June 1999), p. 9.

70. *TCU: Revision of Codes*, *supra* note 1, at 86 n.129 (referring to Code Civ. Proc. § 274c, Gov’t Code § 72194.5 & Penal Code § 869).

71. See *Cases in Which Court Reporter Is Required*, 31 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 223 (2001).

72. See 2002 Cal. Stat. ch. 71 (SB 1371 (Morrow)). Although the court reporter issues assigned by Section 70219 have been resolved, the statutes governing court reporter compensation still contain material made obsolete by trial court restructuring. See CLRC Staff Memorandum 2020-15. The Commission is authorized to study those statutes pursuant to other sources of authority. See Gov’t Code § 71674; 2018 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 158 (item #12). The situation is complicated and the Commission will proceed with the statutory clean-up when it appears feasible to do so.

73. See 1999 Cal. Stat. ch. 344, § 25 (conforming Penal Code § 1238 to Penal Code § 1424(a)(2)); *TCU Follow-Up*, *supra* note 28, at 664.

74. See *Trial Court Unification: Publication of Legal Notice*, 44 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 385 (2015).

75. See 2016 Cal. Stat. ch. 2881 (AB 2881 (Committee on Judiciary)).

76. See 1998 Cal. Stat. ch. 485, §§ 94-100.5 (AB 2803 (Committee on Judiciary)).

1 *Default in an unlawful detainer case.* The Commission studied and proposed
2 legislation on default in an unlawful detainer case. The proposed legislation was
3 enacted.⁷⁷

4 *Whether to make revisions regarding the repository for the duplicate of an affidavit*
5 *pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 2357.* The Commission studied and made
6 recommendations on this topic, providing opportunities for stakeholder input.⁷⁸ The
7 proposed legislation was enacted.⁷⁹

8 **Recommendation and Request for Comments**

9 Because all of the studies required by Government Section 70219 are done, the
10 Commission tentatively recommends that the section be repealed as obsolete.⁸⁰ **The**
11 **Commission welcomes comments on this matter.** Comments can be in any format and
12 should be sent to bgaal@clrc.ca.gov. To receive optimal consideration, they should be
13 submitted by **September 1, 2020.**

77. See 1999 Cal. Stat. ch. 344, § 19 (correcting cross-references in Code Civ. Proc. § 1167.3); *TCU Follow-Up*, *supra* note 28, at 663.

78. See *Trout Affidavit*, 30 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 319 (2000).

79. See 2000 Cal. Stat. ch. 167, § 1 (SB 1487 (Knight)).

80. See proposed repeal of Gov't Code § 70219 & Comment *infra*.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

1 **Gov't Code § 70219 (repealed). Judicial Council and Law Revision Commission studies and**
2 **recommendations**

3 SECTION 1. Section 70219 of the Government Code is repealed.

4 ~~70219. On submission by the California Law Revision Commission of its report to the~~
5 ~~Governor and the Legislature pursuant to Resolution Chapter 102 of the Statutes of 1997~~
6 ~~recommending statutory changes that may be necessitated by court unification, the~~
7 ~~Judicial Council and the California Law Revision Commission shall study and make~~
8 ~~recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature on the issues identified in the~~
9 ~~report as appropriate for future study, including consideration of the experience in~~
10 ~~counties in which the courts have unified. Each agency shall assume primary or joint~~
11 ~~responsibility for the studies and recommendations as outlined in the report, and each~~
12 ~~agency shall consult with the other in the studies and recommendations. This section does~~
13 ~~not limit any authority of the Judicial Council or the California Law Revision~~
14 ~~Commission to conduct studies and make recommendations authorized or directed by~~
15 ~~law.~~

16 **Comment.** Section 70219 is repealed as obsolete. All of the assigned studies have been
17 completed. See *Trial Court Restructuring Clean-Up: Completion of Studies Under Government*
18 *Code Section 70219*, __ Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports __ (202x).
