Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four - No. B330202

S285484

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

En Banc

CHARLES COHEN et al., Petitioners,

v.

SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, Respondent;

THOMAS SCHWARTZ, Individually and as Trustee, etc., et al., Real Parties in Interest.

The petition for review is granted.

Pending review, the opinion of the Court of Appeal, which is currently published at 102 Cal.App.5th 706, may be cited, not only for its persuasive value, but also for the limited purpose of establishing the existence of a conflict in authority that would in turn allow trial courts to exercise discretion under *Auto Equity Sales, Inc. v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 450, 456, to choose between sides of any such conflict. (See *Standing Order Exercising Authority Under California Rules of Court, Rule 8.1115(e)(3), Upon Grant of Review or Transfer of a Matter with an Underlying Published Court of Appeal Opinion*, Administrative Order 2021–04–21; Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(e)(3) and corresponding Comment, par. 2.)

The issue to be briefed and argued is limited to the following: Does Government Code section 36900, subdivision (a) confer upon private citizens a right to redress violations of municipal ordinances?

GUERRERO
Chief Justice

CORRIGAN
Associate Justice

LIU
Associate Justice

KRUGER
Associate Justice

GROBAN
Associate Justice

JENKINS
Associate Justice

EVANS
Associate Justice

Supreme Court of California

JORGE E. NAVARRETE
CLERK AND EXECUTIVE OFFICER
OF THE SUPREME COURT

EARL WARREN BUILDING
350 McALLISTER STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
(415) 865-7000

September 18, 2024

Keith J. Turner
Turner Law Firm A.P.C.
11878 La Grange Avenue
Second Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Re: S285484 - COHEN v. S.C. (SCHWARTZ)

Dear Counsel:

We are enclosing a copy of this court's order granting review in the above referenced case. Your attention is directed to two provisions of the California Rules of Court, and one provision of the court's Internal Operating Practices and Procedures (IOPPs).

First, regarding rule 8.520, which concerns briefing requirements: Please ensure that submissions for filing reflect the case number, title and party designations appearing on the court's order.

Second, concerning rule 8.29: Please ensure that you have served documents on the Attorney General or other nonparty public officers, including any relevant district attorney, as required by that rule and related statutes listed in Judicial Council form AAP-004 ("Civil Case Information Statement" -- see https://www.courts.ca.gov/12423.htm).

Finally, pursuant to IOPP section (§ IV, ¶ L), when review is granted each party must file a "Certification of Interested Entities or Persons" that lists any persons, associations of persons, firms, partnerships, corporations (including parent and subsidiary corporations) or other entities other than the parties themselves known by the party to have either (i) a financial interest in the subject matter of the controversy or in a party to the proceeding; or (ii) any other kind of interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding. For this purpose, we enclose a form for your use. This letter is the sole communication to all counsel for Real Party in Interest. If other associated counsel are better situated to provide the required information, please reroute the enclosure to that person or those persons. The completed form and seven copies should be returned to us within 15 days.

Very truly yours,

JORGE E. NAVARRETE
Clerk and
Executive Officer of the Supreme Court

Gabriela Muca, Deputy Clerk

Enclosure
cc: Rec.

≺ CERTIFICATION OF ≻
INTERESTED ENTITIES OR PERSONS

S285484 - COHEN v. S.C. (SCHWARTZ)

Full Name of Interested Entity/Person	**Party / Non-Party**		**Nature of Interest**
	☐	☐	
	☐	☐	
	☐	☐	
	☐	☐	
	☐	☐	
	☐	☐	
	☐	☐	
	☐	☐	
	☐	☐	
	☐	☐	
	☐	☐	
	☐	☐	

Submitted by: Keith J. Turner