

Meeting

10/8/62

Memorandum No. 60(1962)

Subject: Study No. 52(L) - Sovereign Immunity (Defense of Actions Brought Against Public Employees)

Attached is a copy of the revised tentative recommendation relating to Defense of Actions Brought Against Public Officers and Employees.

We propose that this recommendation and proposed legislation be printed as a separate pamphlet. We want to send it to the printer and have it printed as soon as possible. We also need to have the bill preprinted as soon as possible. Accordingly, we need to give final approval to the text of the recommendation and the proposed statute at the October meeting.

A sample of the Cover and Title Page for this publication and of the Letter of Transmittal is also attached.

We propose to make the following changes in the revised tentative recommendation:

(1) We propose that the title be changed to "Defense of Actions and Proceedings Brought Against Public Employees." This would delete the words "Officers and" from the present title and insert the words "and Proceedings". The words "and Proceedings" would cover administrative proceedings.

(2) The new part added to Division 3.6 would be Part 7 instead of Part 6. See page 25 et seq. of the tentative recommendation attached. This change is required in view of the organization of Division 3.6. See Memorandum No. 74(1962) for outline of Division 3.6.

(3) We propose to renumber some of the sections in the first portion of the statute. Section 993.1 (page 12 of tentative recommendation) would

C
be numbered as 995.2; Section 993.2 would be numbered as 995.4, etc. These changes are recommended so that the section numbers in Chapter 6 at the first part of the statute will conform to the section numbers in Part 7 (at the end of the statute). This change will facilitate amendments at the legislative session since the sections in the first part of the statute will have the same section numbers as the comparable sections in the latter part of the statute. Conforming changes will be made in the title and other parts of the proposed statute.

(4) The definitions in the recommended legislation will need to be conformed to the definitions we ultimately formulate for the general liability statute.

(5) In order to clarify the recommended statute, the following changes should be made:

C
(a) In Section 993.1: before "in the scope of his employment" insert "where the act or omission occurred".

(b) In Section 993.3: before "in the performance of his employment" delete "occurring" and insert "where the act or omission occurred".

(c) In Section 993.4(b): delete "occurring" and insert "where the act or omission occurred".

(d) In Section 995.2 (page 25): make change comparable to one made in Section 993.1.

(e) In Section 995.6 (page 26): make change comparable to one made in Section 993.3.

(f) In Section 995.8(b) (page 26): make change comparable to one made in Section 993.4(b).

C
We did not receive any comments on the revised tentative recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

John H. DeMouilly
Executive Secretary

[Cover and Title page]

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

C A L I F O R N I A L A W R E V I S I O N C O M M I S S I O N

R E C O M M E N D A T I O N

relating to

S O V E R E I G N I M M U N I T Y

Defense of Actions and Proceedings Brought
Against Public Employees

January 1963

California Law Revision Commission
School of Law
Stanford University
Stanford, California



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION

COMMISSION MEMBERS

HERMAN F. SELVIN
Chairman
223 West 6th Street
Los Angeles 14

JOHN R. McDONOUGH, Jr.
Vice-Chairman
School of Law
Stanford University

JAMES A. COBEY
Member of the Senate
P. O. Box 1229
Merced

CLARK L. BRADLEY
Member of the Assembly
802 First National Bank Bldg.
San Jose 13

JOSEPH A. BALL
120 Linden Avenue
Long Beach 2

JAMES R. EDWARDS
599 Arrowhead Avenue
San Bernardino

RICHARD H. KEATINGE
3325 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles 5

SHO SATO
School of Law
University of California
Berkeley

THOMAS E. STANTON, Jr.
111 Sutter Street
San Francisco

ANGUS C. MORRISON
Ex Officio
Legislative Counsel
3021 State Capitol
Sacramento 14

[For use in printed pamphlet]

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

January 2, 1963

COMMISSION STAFF

JOHN H. DeMOULLY
Executive Secretary

JOSEPH B. HARVEY
Assistant Executive Secretary

JON D. SMOCK

Office of Commission and Staff
School of Law
Stanford University, California

To His Excellency Edmund G. Brown
Governor of California
and to the Legislature of California

The California Law Revision Commission was authorized by Resolution Chapter 202 of the Statutes of 1957 to make a study to determine whether the doctrine of sovereign or governmental immunity in California should be abolished or revised.

The Commission herewith submits its recommendation on one portion of this subject-- defense of actions and proceedings brought against public employees. Recommendations covering other aspects of this subject are contained in other reports prepared for the 1963 legislative session. The Commission has also published a research study relating to sovereign immunity prepared by its research consultant, Professor Arvo Van Alstyne of the School of Law, University of California at Los Angeles.

Herman F. Selvin, Chairman
John R. McDonough, Jr., Vice
Chairman
James A. Cobey, Member of the
Senate
Clark L. Bradley, Member of the
Assembly
Joseph A. Ball
James R. Edwards
Richard H. Keatinge
Sho Sato
Thomas E. Stanton, Jr.
Angus C. Morrison, Legislative
Counsel, ex officio

Revised September 1, 1962

52(L)

June 1, 1962

CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION
School of Law
Stanford, California

REVISED

TENTATIVE RECOMMENDATION

of the

CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION

relating to

Defense of Actions Brought Against Public Officers

and Employees

NOTE: This is a tentative recommendation prepared by the California Law Revision Commission. It is not a final recommendation and the Commission should not be considered as having made a recommendation on a particular subject until the final recommendation of the Commission on that subject has been submitted to the Legislature. This material is being distributed at this time for the purpose of obtaining suggestions and comments from the recipients and is not to be used for any other purpose.

REVISED
TENTATIVE RECOMMENDATION
of the
CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION
relating to

Defense of Actions Brought Against Public Officers and Employees

A number of California statutes either authorize or require public entities to defend actions and proceedings brought against their officers and employees. The two principal statutes are Section 2001 of the Government Code and Section 13007.1 of the Education Code.

Government Code Section 2001 requires that, upon request, a public entity defend a civil action or proceeding brought against its officer, agent or employee on account of any act or failure to act occurring during the course of his service or employment.¹ The section covers all public entities and includes all torts, whether negligent or intentional. Unless provision is made by the public entity for the employment of other counsel, the attorney for the public entity is required to act as defense counsel. The Attorney General has ruled that the lack of a regular or part-time counsel, or the disqualification or incapacity of regular counsel, does not relieve the public entity from the duty of defending the action or proceeding.²

1. Under Section 2001, the officer, agent or employee is not entitled to be defended at public expense if the action or proceeding is brought to remove him from his office, agency or employment or is brought by a public entity against him as an individual and not in his official capacity.

2. 39 Adv. Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 71 (1962).

Section 2001 was substantially amended in 1961. Prior to the 1961 amendment, the section apparently required a preliminary determination that the defendant had acted in good faith and without malice before he was entitled to be defended at public expense.³ Now, however, the section requires the public entity to defend the action or proceeding--even though the public entity believes that the defendant may have acted or failed to act because of bad faith or malice--and permits the public entity to recover the cost of the defense from the defendant if it is later established that he acted or failed to act because of bad faith or malice.

Section 2001 does not spell out the remedies available to the defendant in case the entity refuses to defend him upon request. The traditional remedy would be to petition for a writ of mandate to compel the appropriate public officials to act.⁴ In cases where this remedy would not be adequate, the defendant apparently may retain his own counsel upon the refusal of the public entity to do so, and the public entity must reimburse him for the reasonable amount of attorney's fees and costs incurred.⁵

3. The section did not indicate by whom this determination was to be made. See *Tracy v. Fresno County*, 125 C.A.2d 52, 56-57, 270 P.2d 57(1954).

4. 39 Adv. Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 71 (1962).

5. Although Section 2001 does not expressly authorize this remedy, this is the interpretation given the section by the Attorney General. See 39 Adv. Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 71(1962). Presumably the officer, agent or employee would have to establish that he was in the course of his service or employment at the time of the act or omission; proof by the public entity that he acted or failed to act because of bad faith or malice apparently would defeat his attempt to obtain reimbursement.

Although Section 2001 purports to apply to all public personnel, school district officers and employees are also covered by a special statute (Education Code Section 13007.1) enacted in 1961. Section 13007.1, which adopts the basic scheme that was rejected when Section 2001 was amended in 1961, provides that a school district officer or employee is entitled to a defense at public expense only after a determination by the governing board of the school district that "the officer or employee performed his official duty in good faith in the apparent interests of the school district and without malice and that such defense would otherwise be in the best interests of the school district."⁶

Section 2001 also overlaps and conflicts with other California statutes.⁷ For example, Government Code Section 2000, which applies only to cities, counties and school districts, apparently permits a public officer included within its terms to retain his own attorney without first requesting that the public entity defend the action and gives the officer the right to recover the cost of defending the action from the public entity. Government Code Section 2002.5, which applies only to an officer or employee of the State licensed in one of the

6. See also Cal. Ed. Code § 1043, relating to defense of school district officers and employees.

7. Cal. Govt. Code §§ 2000, 2002.5, 26524, 26529, 61632; Cal. Ed. Code § 1043; Cal. Water Code §§ 31088, 60201; Kings River Conservation District Act (Chapter 1728, Statutes of 1959) § 15; Municipal Water District Act of 1911 (Chapter 62, Statutes of 1951) § 21; Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency Law (Chapter 2146, Statutes of 1959) § 76; Desert Water Agency Law (Chapter 1069, Statutes of 1961) § 24; San Geronio Pass Water Agency Law (Chapter 1435, Statutes of 1961) § 24. Cf. Cal. Water Code § 5901, Art. IX(A) 6 (Klamath River Basin Compact).

healing arts, requires that the Attorney General defend the officer or employee upon request, but it is not clear whether the State can recover the expenses of such defense from the officer or employee if it is later established that he acted or failed to act because of bad faith or malice.

The Law Revision Commission has concluded that the present overlapping and inconsistent statutes should be replaced by a general statute providing for the defense of public personnel at public expense.

Neither Section 13007.1 nor Section 2001 provides a satisfactory scheme for the new general statute. Section 13007.1 does not adequately protect a deserving public officer, agent or employee, for this section apparently leaves the decision as to whether he will be defended at public expense entirely to the discretion of the public entity. Section 2001 is also unsatisfactory, primarily because it requires the public entity to defend an action or proceeding even if the defendant actually acted or failed to act because of bad faith, corruption or malice. It seems contrary to sound public policy to expend public funds to defend a civil action or proceeding against such a defendant. Yet this can be the result under Section 2001 because the right to recover the cost of the defense will be effective only to the extent of the defendant's financial resources. Moreover, Section 2001 does not adequately protect the deserving public officer, agent or employee in cases where a conflict of interest may arise under its provisions. For example, the interest of the public entity may best be served by seeking to establish in the action against the officer, agent or employee--contrary to his interest--that he acted or failed to act because of bad faith or malice, for the public entity⁸ can then under Section 2001 recover from him the cost of his defense.

8. See note 10, infra.

To eliminate this possible conflict of interest and at the same time to assure that deserving public employees⁹ will be defended at public expense, the Commission makes the following recommendations:

1. Upon request by a public employee, a public entity should be required to defend a civil action or proceeding brought against him on account of any alleged negligent or wrongful act or omission in the scope of his employment unless the public entity determines (a) that the act or omission was not within the scope of his employment or (b) that he acted or failed to act because of actual fraud, corruption or actual malice or (c) that the defense of the action or proceeding would create a conflict of interest between the public entity and the employee.

If the public entity defends the action or proceeding, it should have no right to recover the costs of the defense from the employee. This will eliminate the possible conflict of interest pointed out above, for the public entity need not defend the action or proceeding if it determines that the employee acted or failed to act because of actual fraud, corruption or actual malice.¹⁰

-
9. As used in this tentative recommendation, "employee" includes an officer, agent or employee, and "employment" includes office, agency or employment.
10. A more serious conflict of interest problem could arise in cases where the public entity is required to pay the judgment secured against the public employee unless the judgment is based on his actual fraud or actual malice. E.g., Municipal Water District Act of 1911 (Chapter 62, Statutes of 1951) §21; Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency Law (Chapter 2146, Statutes of 1959) §76; Desert Water Agency Law (Chapter 1069, Statutes of 1961) §24; San Geronio Pass Water Agency Law (Chapter 1435, Statutes of 1961) §24. This problem is dealt with in another recommendation. See Recommendation of the California Law Revision Commission relating to Tort Liability of Public Entities and Public Officers and Employees at 16-17 (September 1, 1962).

C The public entity in defending a civil action or proceeding brought against a public employee could, under the recommended legislation, take any appropriate action necessary to defend the action or proceeding, including the prosecution of a counter claim, cross complaint or cross action by the employee against the plaintiff in the action being defended by the public entity.

C 2. The public employee should have two remedies if the public entity fails or refuses to provide him with a defense at public expense. First, he should be permitted to petition for a writ of mandate to compel the public entity to perform its statutory duty. This remedy would, however, rarely be effective where the public entity refuses to defend because it has determined that the defendant was not within the scope of his employment at the time of the act or omission or that he was guilty of actual fraud, corruption or actual malice or that the defense would create a conflict of interest between the entity and the employee, for such a determination would involve an exercise of discretion which a court would be unlikely to reverse. Nor would a petition for a writ of mandate be a satisfactory remedy if it becomes necessary for the public employee to obtain counsel immediately by reason of limitations upon the time within which to appear and answer the complaint in the action against him. A second remedy should, therefore, be available to the defendant when the public entity fails or refuses to defend him: He should be given a cause of action against the public entity to recover the reasonable expenses he necessarily incurs in defending the action or proceeding if he establishes that the act or omission occurred in the scope of his employment and the public entity fails to establish that he was

C

11

guilty of actual fraud, corruption or actual malice. The Attorney General has ruled that both of these remedies are available under appropriate circumstances under the existing law.

12

3. A public entity should be authorized to defend a criminal action or proceeding brought against an employee on account of an alleged wrongful act or omission occurring in the performance of his employment if the public entity determines that he acted in good faith and without actual malice in the apparent interests of the public entity and that such defense would be in the best interests of the public entity. Public entities do

13

not now have this authority. The Commission has been advised, however, that cases occasionally arise where a criminal proceeding is brought against a public employee who was simply carrying out his orders. For example, one case brought to the attention of the Commission involved a school district employee charged with criminal assault for ejecting a bully from a school playground. Because the school district was not authorized to provide him with counsel, this employee was required to secure his own attorney to make an appropriate motion to dismiss the criminal proceedings brought against him. The Commission has concluded, therefore,

11. Since the employee is entitled to be defended at public expense only if the act or omission occurred in the scope of his employment, he has the burden of proof on this issue. The burden of proving that he is not entitled to reimbursement because he acted or failed to act because of actual fraud, corruption or actual malice is placed on the public entity; if the burden of proof on this issue were placed on the employee, it would put him in the difficult position of having to prove a negative.

12. 39 Adv. Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 71 (1962).

13. But see Cal. Govt. Code § 61632; Cal. Water Code §§ 31088, 60201; Kings River Conservation District Act §15 (Chapter 1728, Statutes of 1959).

C that it would be sound public policy to give public entities a limited discretionary authority to defend criminal actions and proceedings brought against their employees.

A public entity should also be authorized to defend an administrative proceeding brought against an employee on account of an act or omission occurring in the performance of his employment if the public entity does not itself initiate the proceeding and determines that the employee acted in good faith and without actual malice in the apparent interests of the public entity and that such defense would be in the best interests of the public entity. A case may arise, for example, where an administrative proceeding is initiated against a public employee who is performing his duties in compliance with regulations established by the public entity.

C Although as a general rule a public employee should be given a right to a defense at public expense against a civil action or proceeding, he should have no recourse against the public entity if it declines to furnish him with a defense against a criminal charge or against an administrative proceeding. Since it is necessary to weigh a great many factors to determine whether the public interest would be served by providing a public employee with a defense against a criminal charge or an administrative proceeding, and since these factors will vary in importance from case to case, the Commission has concluded that the decision whether it is in the public interest to provide such a defense in any particular case is best left to the sound discretion of the public entity. In reaching this conclusion, the Commission is also influenced by the existence of such civil remedies as actions for false arrest, false imprisonment and malicious prosecution that may be available when unfounded criminal charges are made against public personnel.

4. A public employee should not be defended at public expense against an action or proceeding brought by the public entity to remove, suspend or otherwise penalize him. Thus, a public employee would not be entitled to counsel at public expense when his employer brings a judicial or administrative proceeding to remove him, nor would he be entitled to counsel at public expense when he seeks judicial review of administrative disciplinary proceedings brought by his employer. Nor should a public employee be defended at public expense against an action or proceeding brought by the public entity against him as an individual and not in his official capacity.¹⁴ Somewhat similar limitations on the right to be defended at public expense are found in Government Code Section 2001.

5. The recommended legislation should be in addition to and not in lieu of any rights the public employee may have under any contract¹⁵ or under any other law, charter, ordinance or regulation providing for his defense. Government Code Section 2001 contains a similar provision.

14. An action or proceeding is sometimes brought by a public entity against an employee in his official capacity as a test case to determine in advance the validity of a particular expenditure of funds or other proposed action. In these cases, the public employee should be defended at public expense.

15. See 39 Adv. Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 71 (1962).

The Commission's tentative recommendation would be effectuated by the enactment of the following measure:

An act to add Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 992.1) to Division 3.5 of Title 1 of the Government Code, and to add Part 6 (commencing with Section 995) to Division 3.6 of Title 1 of the Government Code as enacted by Senate Bill No.*** of the 1963 Regular Session,¹⁶ and to repeal Sections 2000 and 2001 of, and to amend Sections 2002.5, 26529 and 61632 of, the Government Code, and to repeal Sections 1043 and 13007.1 of the Education Code, and to repeal Section 60201 of, and to amend Section 31088 of, the Water Code, and to amend Section 15 of the Kings River Conservation District Act (Chapter 1728, Statutes of 1959), Section 21 of the Municipal Water District Act of 1911 (Chapter 62, Statutes of 1951), Section 76 of the Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency Law (Chapter 2146, Statutes of 1959), Section 24 of the Desert Water Agency Law (Chapter 1069, Statutes of 1961) and Section 24 of the San Geronio Pass Water Agency Law (Chapter 1435, Statutes of 1961), relating to defense of actions and proceedings brought against public officers, agents and employees.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

-
16. Senate Bill No.*** will be the bill introduced to effectuate the Commission's recommendation relating to tort liability of public entities and public officers and employees. See Recommendation of California Law Revision Commission relating to Tort Liability of Public Entities and Public Officers and Employees. (September 1, 1962).

SECTION 1. Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 992.1) is added to Division 3.5 of Title 1 of the Government Code, to read:

CHAPTER 6. DEFENSE OF PUBLIC OFFICERS **AND EMPLOYEES**

Article 1. Definitions

992.1. Unless the provision or context otherwise requires, the definitions contained in this article govern the construction of this chapter.

992.2. "Action or proceeding" means a judicial action or proceeding, but does not include:

(a) An action or proceeding brought by a public entity to remove, suspend or otherwise penalize its own employee, or an appeal to a court from an administrative proceeding by the public entity to remove, suspend or otherwise penalize its own employee: or

(b) An action or proceeding brought by a public entity against its own employee as an individual and not in his official capacity, or an appeal therefrom.

992.3. "Employee" includes an officer, agent or employee.

992.4. "Employment" includes office, agency or employment.

992.5. "Enactment" means a constitutional provision, statute, charter provision, ordinance or regulation.

992.6. "Local public entity" includes any county or city and any district, local authority or other political subdivision of the State, but does not include the State or any office, officer, department, division, bureau, board, commission or agency of the State claims against which are paid by warrants drawn by the Controller.

992.7. "Public employee" means an employee of a public entity.

992.8. "Public entity" includes the State and any local public entity.

Article 2. Defense of Public Officers and Employees

993.1. Except as otherwise provided in Section 993.2, upon request of an employee or former employee, the public entity shall provide for the defense of any civil action or proceeding brought against him, in his official or individual capacity or both, on account of any alleged negligent or wrongful act or omission in the scope of his employment as an employee of the public entity.

For the purposes of this chapter, a cross action, counter claim or cross complaint against an employee or former employee shall be deemed to be a civil action or proceeding brought against him.

993.2. The public entity may refuse to defend an action or proceeding brought against an employee or former employee if the public entity determines that:

(a) The alleged negligent or wrongful act or omission was not within the scope of his employment; or

(b) He acted or failed to act because of actual fraud, corruption or actual malice; or

(c) The defense of the action or proceeding by the public entity would create a conflict of interest between the public entity and the employee or former employee.

993.3. A public entity may, in its discretion, provide for the defense of a criminal action or proceeding (including a proceeding to remove an officer under Sections 3060 to 3073, inclusive, of the Government Code)

brought against an employee or former employee on account of an alleged wrongful act or omission occurring in the performance of his employment as an employee of the public entity if the public entity determines that he acted in good faith and without actual malice in the apparent interests of the public entity and that such defense would be in the best interests of the public entity.

993.4. A public entity may, in its discretion, provide for the defense of an administrative proceeding brought against an employee or former employee if:

(a) The public entity did not itself institute or initiate the administrative proceeding; and

(b) The administrative proceeding is brought on account of an alleged negligent or wrongful act or omission occurring in the performance of his employment as an employee of the public entity; and

(c) The public entity determines that he acted in good faith and without actual malice in the apparent interests of the public entity and that such defense would be in the best interests of the public entity.

993.5. The public entity may provide for a defense pursuant to this chapter by its own attorney or by employing other counsel for this purpose or by purchasing insurance which requires that the insurer provide the defense. All of the expenses of providing a defense pursuant to this chapter are lawful charges against the public entity. The public entity has no right to recover such expenses from the employee defended.

993.6. Except as otherwise provided in Section 993.7, the mention of the existence of this chapter, or the mention of the fact that the employee

or former employee has or has not requested a defense pursuant to this chapter or that the public entity has or has not provided or refused to provide a defense pursuant to this chapter, during the voir dire examination of jurors or at any other time in the presence of the jury, constitutes grounds for a mistrial.

993.7. If after request a public entity fails or refuses to provide an employee or former employee with a defense against a civil action or proceeding brought against him and the employee retains his own counsel to defend the action or proceeding, he is entitled to recover from the public entity such reasonable attorney's fees, costs and expenses as are necessarily incurred by him in defending the action or proceeding if the action or proceeding arose out of an act or omission in the scope of his employment as an employee of the public entity, but he is not entitled to such reimbursement if the public entity establishes that he acted or failed to act because of actual fraud, corruption or actual malice.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to deprive an employee of the right to petition for a writ of mandate to compel the public entity or the governing body or an employee thereof to perform the duties imposed by this chapter.

993.8. The rights of a public employee under this chapter are in addition to and not in lieu of any rights he may have under any contract or under any other enactment providing for his defense.

C

SEC. 2. Section 2000 of the Government Code is repealed.

[2000.--Whenever suit for damages resulting from

(a)--injuries caused by or due to the inefficiency or incompetency of any appointee or employee of any board or any member thereof, or

(b)--negligence in failing or neglecting to remedy the dangerous or defective condition of any public property or to take such action as is reasonably necessary to protect the public against the condition is brought against any member of a board, the cost of defending the suit, including attorney fees actually expended in defending the suit, is a charge against the county, city or school district of which the member was an officer if the member had neither knowledge nor notice of

(1)--the inefficiency or incompetency of the appointee or employee at the time of the injury, or

(2)--the dangerous or defective condition.]

SEC. 3. Section 2001 of the Government Code is repealed.

[2001.--(1)--As used in this section:

(a)--"Action or proceeding" does not include an action or proceeding to remove an employee from his employment, a criminal action or proceeding against a public employee, or an action or proceeding brought by a public entity against a public employee as an individual and not in his official capacity.

(b)--"Employee" includes an officer, agent or employee.

(c)--"Public entity" includes the State, a county, city, district or other public agency or public corporation.

(2)--Unless provision has been made by the public entity for the employment of other counsel in connection therewith, the attorney for the public entity, upon request of the employee, shall act as counsel in the defense of any action or proceeding brought against an employee of the public entity, in his official or individual capacity, or both, on account of:

(a)--The death or physical injury to person or property as a result of the dangerous or defective condition of any public property; or

(b)--The death or physical injury to person or property as a result of the negligence of such employee occurring during the course of his service or employment; or

(c)--Any damages caused by any act or failure to act by such employee occurring during the course of his service or employment.

(3)--The attorney's fees, costs and expenses of defending

the action or proceeding pursuant to this section are a lawful charge against the public entity. -- The public entity may recover from the public employee any attorney's fees or the reasonable value of legal services rendered, costs or expenses paid or incurred by it under the provisions of this section if the action or proceeding is one described in subdivision (2) (a) of this section and it is established that the public employee acted or failed to act because of bad faith or malice.

(4) -- The rights of a public employee under this section are in addition to and not in lieu of any rights the employee may have under any other law, charter, ordinance or regulation providing for the defense of a public employee.]

SEC. 4. Section 2002.5 of the Government Code is amended to read:

2002.5. Whenever a suit is filed against an employee or officer of the State of California licensed in one of the healing arts under Division 2 of the Business and Professions Code, for malpractice alleged to have arisen out of the performance of his duties as a state employee, a copy of the complaint shall also be served upon the Attorney General [~~and the Attorney General upon the request of such employee shall defend said suit on behalf of such employee~~].

If there is a settlement or judgment in the suit the State shall pay the same; provided, that no settlement shall be effected without the consent of the head of the state agency concerned and the approval of the Attorney General. The settlement of such claims or judgments shall be limited to those arising from acts of such

C

officers and employees of the State in the performance of their duties; or by reason of emergency aid given to inmates, state officials, employees, and to members of the public.

SEC. 5. Section 26529 of the Government Code is amended to read:

C

26529. In counties which have a county counsel, the county counsel shall discharge all the duties vested in the district attorney by Sections 26520, 26522, 26523 and 26524. The county counsel shall defend or prosecute all civil actions and proceedings in which the county or any of its officers is concerned or is a party in his official capacity. [~~He shall defend all suits for damages instituted against officers or employees or former officers and employees for acts performed by them in furtherance of their duties while in the employ~~] Except where the county or district provides other counsel, the county counsel shall defend as provided in Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 992.1) of Division 3.5 of Title 1 of the Government Code any action or proceeding brought against an officer, agent or employee of the county or of any district in the county, the legal services of which are required by law to be performed by [him] the county counsel.

SEC. 6. Section 61632 of the Government Code is amended to read:

C

61632. The district may employ counsel to defend any action or proceeding brought against it [~~or any of its officers, agents,~~

er-employees] on account of any injury, taking, damage, or destruction, or to defend as provided in Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 992.1) of Division 3.5 of Title 1 of the Government Code an action or proceeding brought against any of its officers, agents, or employees, and the fees and expenses, including the cost of any bonds and undertakings, involved therein [~~shall be~~] are a lawful charge against the district.

SEC. 7. Section 1043 of the Education Code is repealed.

[~~1043.--If suit is brought against any member of the governing board of any school district as an individual, for any act, or omission, in the line of his official duty as member of the board, or if suit is brought against any employee of any school district for any act performed in the course of his employment, the district attorney of the county shall defend the member of the board or the individual employee upon request of the governing board of the school district, without fee or other charge.~~]

SEC. 8. Section 13007.1 of the Education Code is repealed.

[~~13007.1.--As used in this section the term "action or proceeding" does not include an action or proceeding to remove an officer or employee from his employment or a criminal action or proceeding brought against an officer or employee.--The term includes all other civil actions or proceedings brought against a school district officer or employee for an act committed during his assigned hours of duty and within the apparent course and scope of his employment.~~]

C

The-attorney-for-a-school-district,-upon-the-request-of-the-officer-or-employee,-shall-act-as-counsel-in-the-defense-of-any action-or-proceeding-brought-against-an-officer-or-employee-of-the school-district-in-his-official-or-individual-capacity,-or-both, on-account-of-any-alleged-tortious-or-criminal-conduct-arising out-of-the-performance-of-any-official-duty,-upon,-and-following, the-determination-of-the-governing-board-of-said-school-district that-the-officer-or-employee-performed-his-official-duty-in-good faith-in-the-apparent-interests-of-the-school-district-and-without malice-and-that-such-defense-would-otherwise-be-in-the-best-interests- of-the-school-district,-

C

The-fees,-costs-and-expenses-of-defending-the-action-or proceeding-pursuant-to-this-section-are-a-lawful-charge-against the-funds-of-the-school-district,--The-school-district-may-recover from-the-officer-or-employee-any-fees,-costs-or-expenses-paid-or incurred-by-it-under-the-provisions-of-this-section-if-it-is-established that-the-officer-or-employee-acted-or-failed-to-act-because-of-bad faith-or-malice.]

SEC. 9. Section 60201 of the Water Code is repealed.

[60201.--The-district-may-employ-counsel-to-defend-any-litigation brought-against-any-director-or-other-officer,-agent-or-employee thereof,-on-account-of-his-official-action,-and-the-fees-and-expenses involved-therein-shall-be-a-lawful-charge-against-the-district.]

SEC. 10. Section 31088 of the Water Code is amended to read:

31088. The district may employ counsel to defend any action

or proceeding brought against it [~~er-any-ef-its-offieers,-agents,~~
~~er-employees~~] on account of any injury, taking, damage, or
destruction, or to defend as provided in Chapter 6 (commencing with
Section 992.1) of Division 3.5 of Title 1 of the Government Code an
action or proceeding brought against any of its officers, agents or
employees, and the fees and expenses involved therein [~~shall-be~~]
are a lawful charge against the district.

SEC. 11. Section 15 of the Kings River Conservation District
Act (Chapter 1728, Statutes of 1959) is amended to read:

Sec 15. Claims for money or damages against the district are
governed by the provisions of Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 700)
of Division 3.5 of Title 1 of the Government Code, except as
provided therein. Claims not governed thereby or by other statutes
or by ordinances or regulations authorized by law and expressly
applicable to such claims shall be prepared and presented to the
governing body, and all claims shall be audited and paid, in the
same manner and with the same effect as are similar claims against
the county. The district may employ counsel to defend any action or
proceeding brought against it [~~er-any-ef-its-direeters,-effieers,~~
~~agents-er-employees~~] on account of any taking, injury, damage or
destruction to any property or injury or damage to any person, or
to defend as provided in Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 992.1)
of Division 3.5 of Title 1 of the Government Code an action or
proceeding brought against any of its officers, agents or employees,
and the fees and expenses involved therein [~~shall-be~~] are a lawful
charge against the district.

SEC. 12. Section 21 of the Municipal Water District Act of 1911 (Chapter 62, Statutes of 1951) is amended to read:

Sec. 21. No director or other officer, agent, or employee of any district shall be liable for any act or omission of any officer, agent or employee appointed or employed by him unless he had actual notice that the person appointed or employed was inefficient or incompetent to perform the service for which such person was appointed or employed or unless he retains the inefficient or incompetent person after notice of the inefficiency or incompetency.

~~[The district may employ counsel to defend any litigation brought against any director or other officer, agent, or employee thereof, on account of his official action, and the fees and expenses involved therein shall be a lawful charge against the district.]~~

If any director or other officer, agent, or employee of the district is held liable for any act or omission in his official capacity, and any judgment is rendered thereon, the district, except in case of his actual fraud or actual malice, shall pay the judgment without obligation for repayment by such director or other officer, agent, or employee.

SEC. 13. Section 76 of the Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency Law (Chapter 2146, Statutes of 1959) is amended to read:

Sec. 76. No director or other officer, agent, or employee of the agency shall be liable for any act or omission of any officer, agent or employee appointed or employed by him unless he had actual notice that the person appointed or employed was inefficient

C

or incompetent to perform the service for which such person was appointed or employed or unless he retains the inefficient or incompetent person after notice of the inefficiency or incompetency.

~~[The agency may employ counsel to defend any litigation brought against any director or other officer, agent, or employee thereof, on account of his official action, and the fees and expenses involved therein shall be a lawful charge against the agency.]~~

If any director or other officer, agent, or employee of the agency is held liable for any act or omission in his official capacity, and any judgment is rendered thereon, the agency, except in case of his actual fraud or actual malice, shall pay the judgment without obligation for repayment by such director or other officer, agent, or employee.

C

SEC. 14. Section 24 of the Desert Water Agency Law (Chapter 1069, Statutes of 1961) is amended to read:

Sec .24 . No director or other officer, agent, or employee of the agency shall be liable for any act or omission of any officer, agent or employee appointed or employed by him unless he had actual notice that the person appointed or employed was inefficient or incompetent to perform the service for which such person was appointed or employed or unless he retains the inefficient or incompetent person after notice of the inefficiency or incompetency.

~~[The agency may employ counsel to defend any litigation brought against any director or other officer, agent, or employee thereof, on account of his official action, and the fees and expenses involved therein shall be a lawful charge against the agency.]~~

If any director or other officer, agent, or employee of the agency is held liable for any act or omission in his official capacity, and any judgment is rendered thereon, the agency, except in case of his actual fraud or actual malice, shall pay the judgment without obligation for repayment by such director or other officer, agent or employee.

SEC. 15. Section 24 of the San Geronio Pass Water Agency Law (Chapter 1435, Statutes of 1961) is amended to read:

Sec. 24. No director or other officer, agent, or employee of the agency shall be liable for any act or omission of any officer, agent or employee appointed or employed by him unless he had actual notice that the person appointed or employed was inefficient or incompetent to perform the service for which such person was appointed or employed or unless he retains the inefficient or incompetent person after notice of the inefficiency or incompetency.

~~[The agency may employ counsel to defend any litigation brought against any director or other officer, agent, or employee thereof, on account of his official action, and the fees and expenses involved therein shall be a lawful charge against the agency.]~~

If any director or other officer, agent, or employee of the agency is liable for any act or omission in his official capacity, and any judgment is rendered thereon, the agency, except in case of his actual fraud or actual malice, shall pay the judgment without obligation for repayment by such director or other officer, agent or employee.

SEC. 16. Part 6 (commencing with Section 995) is added to Division 3.6 of Title 1 of the Government Code as enacted by Senate Bill No. *** of the 1963 Regular Session, to read:

PART 6. DEFENSE OF PUBLIC OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

995. Unless the provision or context otherwise requires, as used in this part, "action or proceeding" means a judicial action or proceeding, but does not include:

(a) An action or proceeding brought by a public entity to remove, suspend or otherwise penalize its own employee, or an appeal to court from an administrative proceeding by the public entity to remove, suspend or otherwise penalize its own employee; or

(b) An action or proceeding brought by a public entity against its own employee as an individual and not in his official capacity, or an appeal therefrom.

995.2. Except as otherwise provided in Section 995.4, upon request of an employee or former employee, the public entity shall provide for the defense of any civil action or proceeding brought against him, in his official or individual capacity or both, on account of any alleged negligent or wrongful act or omission in the scope of his employment as an employee of the public entity.

For the purposes of this part, a cross action, counter claim or cross complaint against an employee or former employee shall be deemed to be a civil action or proceeding against him.

995.4. The public entity may refuse to defend an action or proceeding brought against an employee or former employee if the public entity determines that:

(a) The alleged negligent or wrongful act or omission was not within the scope of his employment; or

(b) He acted or failed to act because of actual fraud, corruption or actual malice; or

(c) The defense of the action or proceeding by the public entity would create a conflict of interest between the public entity and the employee or former employee.

995.6. A public entity may, in its discretion, provide for the defense of a criminal action or proceeding (including a proceeding to remove an officer under Sections 3060 to 3073, inclusive, of the Government Code) brought against an employee or former employee on account of an alleged wrongful act or omission occurring in the performance of his employment as an employee of the public entity if the public entity determines that he acted in good faith and without actual malice in the apparent interests of the public entity and that such defense would be in the best interests of the public entity.

995.8. A public entity may, in its discretion, provide for the defense of an administrative proceeding brought against an employee or former employee if:

(a) The public entity did not itself institute or initiate the administrative proceeding; and

(b) The administrative proceeding is brought on account of an alleged negligent or wrongful act or omission occurring in the performance of his employment as an employee of the public entity; and

(c) The public entity determines that he acted in good faith and

without actual malice in the apparent interests of the public entity and that such defense would be in the best interests of the public entity.

996. The public entity may provide for a defense pursuant to this part by its own attorney or by employing other counsel for this purpose or by purchasing insurance which requires that the insurer provide the defense. All of the expenses of providing a defense pursuant to this part are lawful charges against the public entity. The public entity has no right to recover such expenses from the employee defended.

996.2. Except as otherwise provided in Section 996.4, the mention of the existence of this part, or the mention of the fact that the employee or former employee has or has not requested a defense pursuant to this part or that the public entity has or has not provided or refused to provide a defense pursuant to this part, during the voir dire examination of jurors or at any other time in the presence of the jury, constitutes grounds for a mistrial.

996.4. If after request a public entity fails or refuses to provide an employee or former employee with a defense against a civil action or proceeding brought against him and the employee retains his own counsel to defend the action or proceeding, he is entitled to recover from the public entity such reasonable attorney's fees, costs and expenses as are necessarily incurred by him in defending the action or proceeding if the action or proceeding arose out of an act or omission in the scope of his employment as an employee of the public entity, but he is not entitled to such reimbursement if the public entity establishes that he

acted or failed to act because of actual fraud, corruption or actual malice.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to deprive an employee of the right to petition for a writ of mandate to compel the public entity or the governing body or an employee thereof to perform the duties imposed by this part.

996.6. The rights of a public employee under this part are in addition to and not in lieu of any rights he may have under any contract or under any other enactment providing for his defense.

SEC. 17. Section 26529 of the Government Code is amended to read:

26529. In counties which have a county counsel, the county counsel shall discharge all the duties vested in the district attorney by Sections 26520, 26522, 26523 and 26524. The county counsel shall defend or prosecute all civil actions and proceedings in which the county or any of its officers is concerned or is a party in his official capacity. ~~[He shall defend all suits for damages instituted against officers or employees or former officers and employees for acts performed by them in furtherance of their duties while in the employ]~~ Except where the county or district provides other counsel, the county counsel shall defend as provided in Part 6 (commencing Section 995) of Division 3.6 of Title 1 of the Government Code action or proceeding brought against an officer, agent or employee of the county or of any district in the county, the legal services of which are required by law to be performed by [him]the county counsel.

SEC. 18. Section 61632 of the Government Code is amended to read:

61632. The district may employ counsel to defend any action or proceeding brought against it [~~or any of its officers, agents, or employees~~] on account of any injury, taking, damage, or destruction, or to defend as provided in Part 6 (commencing with Section 995) of Division 3.6 of Title 1 of the Government Code an action or proceeding brought against any of its officers, agents or employees, and the fees and expenses, including the cost of any bonds and undertakings, involved therein [~~shall be~~] are a lawful charge against the district.

SEC. 19. Section 31088 of the Water Code is amended to read:

31088. The district may employ counsel to defend any action or proceeding brought against it [or any of its officers, agents, or employees] on account of any injury, taking, damage, or destruction, or to defend as provided in Part 6 (commencing with Section 995) of Division 3.6 of Title 1 of the Government Code an action or proceeding brought against any of its officers, agents or employees, and the fees and expenses involved therein [~~shall be~~] are a lawful charge against the district.

SEC. 20. Section 15 of the Kings River Conservation District Act (Chapter 1728, Statutes of 1959) is amended to read:

Sec. 15. Claims for money or damages against the district are governed by the provisions of Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 700) of Division 3.5 of Title 1 of the Government Code, except as provided therein. Claims not governed thereby or by other statutes or by ordinances or regulations authorized by law and expressly applicable to such claims shall be prepared and presented to the governing body, and all claims shall be audited and paid, in the same manner and with the same effect as are similar claims against the county. The district may

C
employ counsel to defend any action or proceeding brought against it
[~~er-any-ef-its-directers,-officers,-agents-er-employees~~] on account of
any taking, injury, damage or destruction to any property or injury or
damage to any person, or to defend as provided in Part 6 (commencing with
Section 995) of Division 3.6 of Title 1 of the Government Code an
action or proceeding brought against any of its officers, agents or
employees, and the fees and expenses involved therein [~~shall-be~~] are
a lawful charge against the district.

SEC. 21. Sections 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 of this act shall become
operative only if Senate Bill No. *** is enacted by the Legislature at
its 1963 Regular Session, and in such case at the same time at Senate
Bill No. *** takes effect, at which time Sections 1, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11,
12, 13, 14. and 15 of this act are repealed.