

Study N-200

September 27, 1996

## Memorandum 96-69

**Judicial Review of Agency Action:  
Comments on Revised Tentative Recommendation**

---

Attached is a staff draft of the statutory part of the recommendation on *Judicial Review of Agency Action*, revised to carry out Commission decisions at the last meeting. This Memorandum continues the discussion of comments on the revised Tentative Recommendation. It picks up where we left off at the last meeting, and also discusses issues the Commission wanted to revisit.

The first nine of the attached letters were reproduced for the last meeting. Only those referred to in this Memorandum are attached. We kept the earlier pagination of exhibits, so pagination is discontinuous. The staff has not previously analyzed the last two of the attached letters:

Attorney General Dan Lungren	Exhibit pp. 1-3
Karl Engeman, Office of Administrative Hearings	Exhibit pp. 5-6
Herb Bolz, Office of Admin. Law (memo 8/22/96)	Exhibit pp. 7-9
Herb Bolz, Office of Admin. Law (memo 8/28/96)	Exhibit pp. 10-13
Elisabeth Brandt, Chief ALJ, Dep't of Health Svcs.	Exhibit pp. 19-21
Ruth Sorensen, County Counsels' Association	Exhibit pp. 24-26
State Bar Committee on Administration of Justice	Exhibit pp. 27-31
Samuel Crump, California Judges Association	Exhibit p. 32
Kathleen Yates, Department of General Services	Exhibit pp. 33-35
Steven Bassoff, ACSA, PECG, and CAPS	Exhibit pp. 36-37
Philip Scarfo, Polaroid Corporation	Exhibit pp. 38-39

The following issues are discussed in this Memorandum:

AGENCIES AND PROCEEDINGS TO WHICH STATUTE APPLIES . . . . .	2
Ordinances and Regulations of Local Agencies . . . . .	2
Nongovernmental Entities . . . . .	4
PUC Regulation of Highway Carriers . . . . .	5
STANDING . . . . .	5
SECTIONS IN DRAFT STATUTE . . . . .	8
§ 1123.430. Review of agency fact finding . . . . .	8
§ 1123.450. Review of agency exercise of discretion . . . . .	12
§ 1123.460. Review of agency procedure . . . . .	12
§ 1123.520. Superior court venue . . . . .	13
§ 1123.640. Time for filing petition for review in adjudication of state agency and formal adjudication of local agency . . . . .	14
§ 1123.650. Time for filing petition for review in other adjudicative proceedings . . . . .	14

§ 1123.710. Applicability of rules of practice for civil actions . . . . .	16
§ 1123.720. Stay of agency action . . . . .	17
§ 1123.730. Type of relief . . . . .	18
§ 1123.820. Contents of administrative record . . . . .	18
§ 1123.830. Preparation of record . . . . .	19
§ 1123.840. Disposal of administrative record . . . . .	19
§ 1123.850. New evidence on judicial review . . . . .	20
§ 1123.940. Proceedings in forma pauperis . . . . .	20
SELECTED CONFORMING REVISIONS . . . . .	21
Gov't Code § 11350 (amended). Judicial declaration on validity of regulation . . . . .	21

## AGENCIES AND PROCEEDINGS TO WHICH STATUTE APPLIES

The staff revised Section 1120 in the attached draft to carry out decisions of the Commission at the last meeting. The staff put in the statutes of the Public Utilities Commission and Energy Commission the provisions exempting those agencies from the draft statute. The staff also moved the provision exempting the State Bar Court into the State Bar provisions in the Business and Professions Code. This is consistent with our general treatment of provisions applicable to particular agencies, and will shorten Section 1120 which was becoming lengthy.

### **Ordinances and Regulations of Local Agencies**

At the last meeting, the Commission asked the staff to give more thought to whether a local agency ordinance should be subject to judicial review under the draft statute. Professor Asimow thought it should not be. Under existing law, adoption of an ordinance by a local agency may be reviewed by traditional mandamus or by an action for injunctive or declaratory relief. *Carlton Santee Corp. v. Padre Dam Mun. Water Dist.*, 120 Cal. App. 3d 14, 18-19, 174 Cal. Rptr. 413 (1981) (mandamus to review validity of water district ordinance); 2 G. Ogden, *California Public Agency Practice* § 50.02[3][a] (1996); see also *California Teachers Ass'n v. Ingwerson*, 46 Cal. App. 4th 860, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 917 (1996) (mandamus to compel county to adopt fiscal plan and budget not reducing or freezing salary of certified employees); *Guidotti v. County of Yolo*, 214 Cal. App. 3d 1552, 1561-63, 271 Cal. Rptr. 858, 863-64 (1986) (declaratory and injunctive relief and mandamus to review county resolution setting levels of general relief); *Karlson v. City of Camarillo*, 100 Cal. App. 3d 789, 798, 161 Cal. Rptr. 260 (1980) (mandamus to review amendment of city's general plan); *California Civil Writ Practice* §§ 4.46-4.48, at 122-123 (Cal. Cont. Ed. Bar, 3d ed. 1996).

The argument against subjecting local ordinances to judicial review under the draft statute is that the closed record requirement of the draft statute would virtually preclude a successful challenge. The administrative record for adoption of a local ordinance is often devoid of factual material to support it. Although a court will not receive evidence to overturn an ordinance valid on its face, *Porter v. City of Riverside*, 261 Cal. App. 2d 832, 837, 68 Cal. Rptr. 313 (1968), if an ordinance is not valid on its face, the court will receive evidence to show that because of particular facts it is void as to the plaintiff, *Pacific Rys. Advertising Co. v. City of Oakland*, 98 Cal. App. 165, 168, 276 Pac. 629 (1929) (injunction against enforcement of ordinance). To preserve the ability of the court to receive evidence, review of ordinances would have to be exempted either from the closed record requirement or from the draft statute as a whole.

The 1981 Model State Administrative Procedure Act does not address the question of whether local ordinances should be subject to its judicial review provisions, because it only applies to review of state agencies, not local agencies.

If local ordinances are excluded from the draft statute, should it nonetheless apply to judicial review of local regulations? It may be hard to distinguish an ordinance from a regulation: In the absence of statutory or charter provisions to the contrary, a local legislative act may be in the form either of a resolution or an ordinance. 45 Cal. Jur. 3d *Municipalities* § 188, at 302-303 (1978). Although more formality is required for a local ordinance than for a local regulation, they are quite similar in form. An ordinance need not be in the usual form of an ordinance and need not say “be it ordained,” if it amounts in substance to an ordinance and is passed with the formality of an ordinance. *Creighton v. Manson*, 27 Cal. 613, 629 (1865). If a statute requires a local agency to take legislative action by resolution but the local agency’s charter requires legislative action by ordinance, action by ordinance is deemed to comply with the statute. Gov’t Code § 50020; see also *id.* § 36936.1 (resolution fixing city tax must be published in same manner as an ordinance).

On the other hand, challenges to ordinances are often on constitutional grounds, whereas a regulation will likely be challenged for failure to implement or be consistent with the statute or ordinance on which it is based. This type of challenge lends itself to being addressed to the local agency in the first instance, resulting in some kind of a record for judicial review.

The County Counsels’ Association argues the draft statute should not apply to adoption of local ordinances because local legislative authority is analogous to

the power exercised by the state Legislature. The Association appears not to contend the draft statute should not apply to local agency regulations.

**On balance, the staff would not apply the draft statute to judicial review of local ordinances, but would apply it to review of local agency regulations.** This may be done by adding the following to Section 1120:

(f) This title does not apply to judicial review of an ordinance of a local agency.

Subdivision (c) of Section 1121.290 defining “rule” to include a local agency ordinance should be deleted. The Comment to Section 1120 would say ordinances of local agencies remain subject to judicial review by traditional mandamus or by an action for declaratory or injunctive relief.

### **Nongovernmental Entities**

At the last meeting, the Commission approved the concept of allowing room for courts to apply the judicial review statute to nongovernmental entities where appropriate. However, Professor Asimow had reservations about applying it, for example, to a routine dispute between a private company and its employees under a collective bargaining agreement as in *Wallin v. Vienna Sausage Mfg. Co.*, 156 Cal. App. 3d 1051, 203 Cal Rptr. 375 (1984). The Commission thought the three elements of Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5 should be present — hearing required, evidence required to be taken, and discretion to determine facts vested in the inferior tribunal or officer — and that these elements should be required by “statutory or decisional” law, not merely by private contract. The Commission asked to see a revised draft. **The staff suggests the following:**

~~(e) Except as expressly provided by statute, this title does not apply to~~ This title governs judicial review of action a decision of a nongovernmental entity only if one of the following conditions exists:

(1) A statute expressly so provides.

(2) The decision is made in a proceeding to which Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 11400) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code applies.

(3) Statutory or decisional law requires a hearing, the taking of evidence, and fair procedures, and vests discretion to determine facts in the inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or officer.

**Comment.** . . . Paragraphs (1) and (3) of subdivision (e) codify case law on the availability of administrative mandamus to review a decision of a nongovernmental entity. See, e.g., *Anton v. San Antonio Community Hospital*,

19 Cal. 3d 802, 814, 567 P.2d 1162, 140 Cal. Rptr. 442 (1979); *Pomona College v. Superior Court*, 45 Cal. App. 4th 1716, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 662 (1996); *Delta Dental Plan v. Banasky*, 27 Cal. App. 4th 1598, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 381 (1994); *Wallin v. Vienna Sausage Mfg. Co.*, 156 Cal. App. 3d 1051, 203 Cal. Rptr. 375 (1984); *Bray v. International Molders & Allied Workers Union*, 155 Cal. App. 3d 608, 202 Cal. Rptr. 269 (1984); *Coppernoll v. Board of Directors*, 138 Cal. App. 3d 915, 188 Cal. Rptr. 394 (1983). For a statute applying this title to a nongovernmental entity, see Health & Safety Code § 1339.63 (adjudication by private hospital board). Paragraph (3) is drawn from a portion of the first sentence of Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5(a). Subdivision (e) applies this title only to nongovernmental action of specific application that determines a legal right, duty, privilege, immunity, or other legal interest of a particular person, and not to quasi-legislative acts. See Section 1121.250 (“decision” defined). Whether a hearing and fair procedures are required by law depend on a number of factors, including whether fundamental vested rights are involved or whether the matter is tinged with public stature or purpose. See *Delta Dental Plan v. Banasky*, *supra*; *Wallin v. Vienna Sausage Mfg. Co.*, *supra*. If this title is not available to review a decision of a nongovernmental entity because the requirements of subdivision (e) are not met, traditional mandamus may be available under Section 1085. See California Civil Writ Practice §§ 6.16-6.17, at 203-05 (Cal. Cont. Ed. Bar, 3d ed. 1996).

Paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) recognizes that Government Code Sections 11400-11470.50 apply to some private entities. See Gov’t Code § 11410.60 [in Commission’s recommendation on *Administrative Adjudication by Quasi-Public Entities*].

## **PUC Regulation of Highway Carriers**

Assembly Bill 1683 transfers regulation of most highway property carriers from the PUC to the Department of Motor Vehicles and California Highway Patrol, leaving with the PUC only charter party carriers, passenger stage corporations, and household goods carriers. Under Senate Bill 1322, recently signed by the Governor, judicial review of these PUC matters will remain in the California Supreme Court. At the last meeting, the Commission asked the staff to consider whether the Public Utilities Code should be amended to provide that these proceedings be reviewed in the court of appeal, possibly a single court of appeal. **The staff would not do this in the draft statute.** Having exempted the PUC from the draft statute, the staff would leave to the regulated carriers and PUC the question of to what extent the new provisions in SB 1322 should be further amended.

## **STANDING**

At the last meeting, the Commission preferred the draft alternative with a more restrictive standing rule for judicial review of adjudication. The Commission was concerned about a nonparty to seeking review of adjudication,

particularly in zoning variance cases. There was support for denying standing for review of a zoning variance by a person not a party to the administrative proceeding. The staff would tighten the draft considered at the last meeting by not providing broader standing rules for judicial review of adjudication in land use and environmental cases. This would address the Commission's concern by preventing a neighbor who did not participate in the variance proceeding from obtaining review based purely on private interest standing.

The staff would preserve public interest standing for judicial review of adjudication as illustrated by *Environmental Law Fund, Inc. v. Town of Corte Madera*, 49 Cal. App. 3d 105, 114, 122 Cal. Rptr. 282 (1975). This case involved approval of a conditional use permit and tentative subdivision map for a planned unit development. The court held that failure to exhaust administrative remedies against agency action affecting the entire town in a proceeding to which a person was not a party does not bar him or her from seeking judicial review to enforce important rights which he or she holds as a member of the public. The court said that otherwise the public would be barred from redressing a public wrong, and the town would be burdened in perpetuity with illegal zoning of a substantial area of the community by insulating it from judicial review.

Allowing public interest standing to review adjudication would not be completely open-ended because all requirements for public interest standing would have to be satisfied:

- The right must be important and affect the public interest.
- The person must reside or conduct business in the jurisdiction of the agency or meet the requirements for organizational standing.
- The person must adequately protect the public interest.
- The person must have requested the agency to correct the action.

Also, the “exact issue” rule of Section 1123.350 is further protection against abuse, because it requires the issue on judicial review to have been raised before the agency by somebody.

As redrafted, these provisions would look as follows:

1123.220. (a) An interested person has standing to obtain judicial review of agency action. For the purpose of this section, a person is not interested by the mere filing of a complaint with the agency where the complaint is not authorized by statute or ordinance.

~~(b) An organization that does not otherwise have standing under subdivision (a) has standing if an interested person is a member of the organization, or a nonmember the organization is~~

~~required to represent, and the agency action is germane to the purposes of the organization.~~

**Comment.** . . . If a person is authorized by statute or ordinance to file a complaint with the agency and the complaint is rejected, the person is “interested” within the meaning of Section 1123.220. *Covert v. State Bd. of Equalization*, 29 Cal. 2d 125, 130, 173 P.2d 545 (1946). See also *Spear v. Board of Medical Examiners*, 146 Cal. App. 2d 207, 303 P.2d 886 (1956) (standing to challenge agency refusal to file charges of person expressly authorized by statute to file complaint).

[1123.230 — Public interest standing, as in draft statute.]

1123.240. Notwithstanding any other provision of this article, a person does not have standing to obtain judicial review of a decision in an adjudicative proceeding unless one of the following conditions is satisfied:

(a) ~~The person is a party to a proceeding under Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 11400) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code was a party to the proceeding.~~

(b) The person is ~~was~~ a participant in a ~~the~~ proceeding other than a proceeding described in subdivision (a) and satisfies Section 1123.220 or 1123.230. , and is either interested or the person’s participation was authorized by statute or ordinance. This subdivision does not apply to judicial review of a proceeding under the formal hearing provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

(c) The person has standing under Section 1123.230.

**Comment.** . . . Subdivision (c) is consistent with *Environmental Law Fund, Inc. v. Town of Corte Madera*, 49 Cal. App. 3d 105, 114, 122 Cal. Rptr. 282 (1975). Thus a person may have public interest standing for judicial review of adjudication if the right to be vindicated is an important one affecting the public interest, the person resides or conducts business in the jurisdiction of the agency or meets the requirements for organizational standing, the person will adequately protect the public interest, and the person has requested the agency to correct the action, and the agency has not done so within a reasonable time. Section 1123.230.

1123.250. An organization that does not otherwise have standing under this article has standing if a person who has standing is a member of the organization, or a nonmember the organization is required to represent, the agency action is germane to the purposes of the organization, and the person consents.

**Comment.** Section 1123.250 codifies case law giving an incorporated or unincorporated association, such as a trade union or neighborhood association, standing to obtain judicial review on behalf of its members. See, e.g., *Professional Fire Fighters, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 60 Cal. 2d 276, 384 P. 2d 158, 32 Cal. Rptr. 830 (1963); *Residents of Beverly Glen, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 34 Cal. App. 3d 117, 109 Cal. Rptr. 724 (1973). This principle extends

to standing of the organization to obtain judicial review where a nonmember is adversely affected, as where a trade union is required to represent the interests of nonmembers.

As requested by the Commission, the staff sent this draft to Commissioner Skaggs and to Louis Green, County Counsel for El Dorado County, but too recently for either to be able to reply before distribution of this Memorandum.

Mr. Bassoff is concerned the existing public standing in taxpayers suits is being restricted by the proposed requirements that (1) the petitioner must “adequately protect the public interest,” and (2) that a request must be made to the agency to correct the action. The Comment to Section 1123.230 says the first of these requirements is drawn from the class action provisions of Rule 23(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (representative must “fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class”). This seems like a reasonable requirement, since the judicial review proceeding will have res judicata effect. Thus the court should have discretion to disqualify a petitioner who, for example, lacks the resources to pursue the judicial review proceeding to a successful conclusion. This requirement also seems reasonable in light of concern of the Attorney General about litigation being engendered by the public interest standing provision. **The staff would not delete the requirement that to have public interest standing the petitioner must adequately protect the public interest.**

The Comment to Section 1123.230 says the requirement of a request to the agency to correct the action is drawn from the California Environmental Quality Act which requires the objection to be made first to the agency, and from the requirement in shareholder derivative suits that the plaintiff must show an effort to secure corrective action from the board of directors. Pub. Res. Code § 21177; Corp. Code § 800(b)(2). A request to the agency may cause it to take corrective action itself, thus obviating the need for judicial proceedings. **The staff would not delete the requirement of a request to the agency to correct its action.**

## SECTIONS IN DRAFT STATUTE

The staff plans to discuss only items below preceded by a bullet [•]:

### **§ 1123.430. Review of agency fact finding**

**General comment.** Justice Morrison of the California Judges Association supports replacing independent judgment review of state agency action with substantial evidence review. Mr. Bassoff opposes this recommendation.

- **Reconciling inconsistent provisions.** Karl Engeman of the Office of Administrative Hearings suggests we reconcile two provisions enacted in 1995 on the same subject, viz., the weight to be given to findings of fact of a presiding officer in a state agency adjudication.

- One provision was in the Commission's administrative adjudication bill. It applies to all state agency adjudication, APA and non-APA, and requires the court on judicial review to give great weight to a determination based on credibility of a witness. Gov't Code § 11425.50. Although the statute is unclear whether "determination" includes one made by the agency head after rejecting a proposed decision, the Comment makes this clear: It says great weight is given to credibility findings "by the trier of fact (the presiding officer in an administrative adjudication)," reversing existing law that "gives no weight to the findings of the presiding officer at the hearing." Thus this provision strengthens credibility findings of the presiding officer on judicial review, even if the proposed decision is rejected by the agency head.

- The other provision, enacted in a bill not sponsored by the Commission, applies only to the Division of Medical Quality of the Medical Board and the Board of Podiatric Medicine and requires these agencies to give great weight on administrative review to all findings of fact of an ALJ unless controverted by new evidence. Bus. & Prof. Code § 2335, *as amended by* 1995 Cal. Stat. ch. 708. Although this provision is cast in terms of administrative review by the agency, it necessarily affects judicial review as well by increasing the likelihood the court will overturn agency rejection of an ALJ's decision and reinstate the original findings in a medical case.

- **Deference by agency as well as court.** Mr. Engeman thinks the Commission-recommended provision should make clear the agency as well as the court must defer to ALJ credibility determinations. This suggestion is sound in principle, even though the practical effect of requiring both the agency and the court to defer is the same as merely requiring the court to do so, since in any event the provision can only be enforced on judicial review.

- Mr. Engeman's suggestion is also consistent with Professor Asimow's recommendation. Professor Asimow recommended that, where the standard of judicial review of fact-finding is substantial evidence, both the reviewing agency and court should give great weight to ALJ credibility determinations. Asimow, *Toward a New California Administrative Procedure Act: Adjudication Fundamentals*, 39 UCLA L. Rev. 1067, 1119 (1992). For independent judgment review, he

recommended the great weight requirement not apply. Instead, the court should consider the ALJ's proposed decision and the agency's final decision, giving whatever weight to either the court finds appropriate. The court is likely to be more impressed by credibility findings of the ALJ who heard the witnesses, rather than those made by an agency head who did not. *Id.* at 1120-21.

- **The staff recommends:**

- **Government Code Section 11425.50 (administrative adjudication bill of rights) should be revised to make clear the agency must give great weight to credibility determinations of the ALJ.** This would be technical, clarifying, and precatory, but still might be a useful encouragement to agency heads.

- **The requirement in Government Code Section 11425.50 that the court give great weight to credibility determinations should be moved into the proposed judicial review statute (Section 1123.430).** Also Section 1123.430(c) should be revised as suggested by the AG to make clear independent judgment review of a changed finding is limited to that finding.

**Code Civ. Proc. § 1123.430. Review of agency fact finding**

1123.430. (a) Except as provided in Section 1123.440, the standard for judicial review of whether agency action is based on an erroneous determination of fact made or implied by the agency is whether the agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in the light of the whole record.

(b) If the factual basis for a decision in a state agency adjudication includes a determination of the presiding officer based substantially on the credibility of a witness, the court shall give great weight to the determination to the extent the determination identifies the observed demeanor, manner, or attitude of the witness that supports it.

(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (a) any other provision of this section, the standard for judicial review of a determination of fact made by an administrative law judge employed by the Office of Administrative Hearings that is changed by the agency head is the independent judgment of the court whether the agency's determination of that fact is supported by the weight of the evidence.

**Comment.** . . . Subdivision (b) continues the substance of language formerly found in Government Code Section 11425.50(b). The requirement that the presiding officer identify specific evidence of observed demeanor, manner, or attitude of the witness in credibility cases is in that section.

Under subdivision (c), independent judgment review of a changed determination of fact is limited to that fact. All other factual determinations are reviewed using the standard of subdivision (a) — substantial evidence in light of the whole record.

**Gov't Code § 11425.50 (amended). Decision**

11425.50. (a) The decision shall be in writing and shall include a statement of the factual and legal basis for the decision as to each of the principal controverted issues.

(b) The statement of the factual basis for the decision may be in the language of, or by reference to, the pleadings. If the statement is no more than mere repetition or paraphrase of the relevant statute or regulation, the statement shall be accompanied by a concise and explicit statement of the underlying facts of record that support the decision. If the factual basis for the decision includes a determination of the presiding officer based substantially on the credibility of a witness, the statement shall identify any specific evidence of the observed demeanor, manner, or attitude of the witness that supports the determination, and on judicial administrative review the court agency shall give great weight to the determination to the extent the determination identifies the observed demeanor, manner, or attitude of the witness that supports it.

(c) . . . .

**Comment.** Subdivision (b) of Section 11425.50 is amended to apply to the reviewing agency the requirement that great weight be given to factual determinations of the presiding officer based on credibility, consistent with requiring the court on judicial review to do the same. The former requirement in subdivision (b) that the court give great weight on judicial review to determinations of the presiding officer based on credibility is continued in Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.430(b). Subdivision (b) requires the agency to give great weight to factual determinations, but not to application of law to fact.

**Review of changed finding of fact.** The Department of Health Services would broaden application of independent judgment review when an ALJ's finding of fact is changed by the agency head by deleting the requirement that the presiding officer must be employed by the Office of Administrative Hearings. Although DHS uses in-house ALJs, it says its proceedings have the formality of APA hearings. This provision was approved at the February meeting as a compromise between having substantial evidence review of all fact-finding and the opposition of the State Bar Committee on Administration of Justice and public employee organizations to any narrowing of existing independent judgment review. Professor Asimow opposes further expansion of independent judgment review. The staff would not apply independent judgment review of a changed finding of fact in all state agency adjudication, because many are quite informal and involve presiding officers who are not attorneys, such as in DMV licensing proceedings.

We could adopt the DHS suggestion by applying independent judgment review to a changed finding of fact “by a presiding officer who is an incumbent administrative law judge as defined by the State Personnel Board for each class specification for Administrative Law Judge.” **On balance, the staff would not further expand independent judgment review as suggested by DHS.**

#### **§ 1123.450. Review of agency exercise of discretion**

Section 1123.450 continues existing abuse of discretion review of agency exercise of discretion. The State Bar Committee on Administration of Justice supports this provision.

- A staff note under Section 1123.450 asks whether subdivision (b) should be deleted as unnecessary, and its substance put in the Comment. Mr. Bolz suggests keeping subdivision (b) because it helps clarify complex issues. However, the staff is concerned that subdivision (b) states the obvious and, if kept here, similar language will have to be included in Section 1123.460 (review of agency procedure) as well. **The staff believes subdivision (b) should be deleted and its substance put in the Comment** where it will serve equally well to clarify the interrelationship of Section 1123.450 with Sections 1123.420 and 1123.430.

1123.450. (a) The standard for judicial review of whether agency action is a proper exercise of discretion, including an agency’s determination under Section 11342.2 of the Government Code that a regulation is reasonably necessary to effectuate the purpose of the statute that authorizes the regulation, is abuse of discretion.

~~(b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), and subject to Section 1123.440, to the extent agency exercise of discretion is based on a determination of fact, made or implied by the agency, the standard for judicial review is whether the agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in the light of the whole record.~~

**Comment.** . . . The standard of review of agency fact-finding in connection with an exercise of discretion is prescribed by the appropriate section in this article. See Sections 1123.430-1123.440 .

#### **§ 1123.460. Review of agency procedure**

Section 1123.460 codifies existing law on independent judgment of the court and the deference due agency determination of procedures. The State Bar Committee on Administration of Justice supports this provision.

Mr. Bolz is concerned the language providing for independent judgment review of whether the agency engaged in an unlawful procedure or decisionmaking process or failed to follow prescribed procedure might be

applied in the rulemaking context to overturn the rule of the *Engelmann* case that an agency determination that it was not required to follow APA rulemaking procedures was of “no significance.” **The staff would address this by adding the following to the Comment:**

Section 1123.460 merely prescribes the standard of review of an agency’s determination of its procedures, but it does not affect the legal significance of the determination. Thus Section 1123.460 does not change the rule of *Engelmann v. State Bd. of Educ.*, 2 Cal. App. 4th 47, 59, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 264, 272 (1992), that an agency determination that it was not required to follow the rulemaking procedures of the Administrative Procedure Act was of “no significance.”

Mr. Bolz also suggests the Comment cite California authority for the statement that the section codifies existing law. **The staff would add the following to the Comment:** See *California Hotel & Motel Ass’n v. Industrial Welfare Comm’n*, 25 Cal. 3d 200, 209-216, 157 Cal. Rptr. 453, 457-58 (1982); *City of Fairfield v. Superior Court*, 14 Cal. 3d 768, 776, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543, 547 (1975).

#### **§ 1123.520. Superior court venue**

- Section 1123.520 continues existing venue for review of state agency action, with the addition of Sacramento County. The existing administrative mandamus statute has no venue provisions, so venue rules for civil actions apply — generally in the county where the cause of action arose. California Administrative Mandamus, *supra*, § 8.16, at 269. Professor Asimow recommended superior court venue be either in Sacramento County or, if the agency is represented by the Attorney General, in counties where the AG has an office (Sacramento, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Diego). He thought superior court judges in small counties are probably inexperienced in administrative law, and consolidating judicial review in a few large counties would permit development of judicial expertise, avoid possible local bias, and minimize forum-shopping. Asimow, *A Modern Judicial Review Statute to Replace Administrative Mandamus* 38-39 (Nov. 1993). The Commission rejected this approach out of concern that limiting venue to a few large counties would often be inconvenient for private parties, and might result in a pro-agency bias.

- The State Bar Committee on Administration of Justice and the Attorney General take opposing views on venue. CAJ opposes adding Sacramento County

as an additional proper place of venue because it will be inconvenient for private parties. The AG renews his suggestion that venue be limited to a few large counties to permit specialization and development of judicial expertise. **Does the Commission wish to reconsider Sacramento County venue?**

**§ 1123.640. Time for filing petition for review in adjudication of state agency and formal adjudication of local agency**

**§ 1123.650. Time for filing petition for review in other adjudicative proceedings**

At the last meeting, the Commission decided that the limitations period should be tolled while the record is being prepared if the request for the record is timely. Enough formality should be required in requesting the record to provide a clear basis for determining when tolling begins. The existing tolling provision for administrative mandamus merely requires a “request” for the record. Gov’t Code § 11523. Under existing practice, no particular written form is required — a letter is sufficient. California Administrative Mandamus, *supra*, § 8.6, at 258. **The staff would continue this rule by requiring the request to be written.**

- The existing 90-day limitations period to review a local agency decision is tolled while the affected person pursues available administrative remedies, such as applying for a hearing. Farmer v. City of Inglewood, 134 Cal. App. 3d 130, 141, 185 Cal. Rptr. 9 (1982). The implication is that the limitations period is tolled during a stay. Cf. Gov’t Code § 11519 (stay delays effective date of decision under APA). **The staff would add to Section 1123.650 a provision like that in Section 1123.640, extending the time to petition for review if a stay is granted.**

These two tolling provisions may be added by revising Sections 1123.640 and 1123.650 as follows:

1123.640. (a) The Subject to Section 1123.655, the petition for review of a decision of a state agency in an adjudicative proceeding, and of a decision of any agency in a proceeding under Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code, shall be filed not later than 30 days after the decision is effective or after the notice required by Section 1123.630 is delivered, served, or mailed, whichever is later.

(b) For the purpose of this section:

(1) A decision in a proceeding under Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code is effective at the time provided in Section 11519 of the Government Code.

(2) A decision of a state agency in an adjudicative proceeding other than under Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code is effective 30 days after it is delivered or mailed to the person to which the decision is directed, unless any of the following conditions exist:

(A) A reconsideration is ordered within that time pursuant to express statute or rule.

(B) The agency orders that the decision is effective sooner.

(C) A stay is granted.

(D) A different effective date is provided by statute or regulation.

(c) The Subject to subdivision (d), the time for filing the petition for review is extended for a party during :

(1) During any period when the party is seeking reconsideration of the decision pursuant to express statute or rule, but in .

(2) If, within 15 days after the decision is effective, the party makes a written request to the agency to prepare all or any part of the record, until 30 days after the record is delivered to the party.

(d) In no case shall a petition for review of a decision described in subdivision (a) be filed later than one hundred eighty days after the decision is effective.

1123.650. (a) The petition for review of a decision in an adjudicative proceeding, other than a decision governed by Section 1123.640, shall be filed not later than 90 days after the decision is announced or after the notice required by Section 1123.630 is given, whichever is later.

(b) The Subject to subdivision (c), the time for filing the petition for review is extended as to a party during :

(1) During any period when a stay of the decision is in effect, or when the party is seeking reconsideration of the decision pursuant to express statute, regulation rule, charter, or ordinance, but in .

(2) If, within 15 days after the decision is announced, the party makes a written request to the agency to prepare all or any part of the record, until 30 days after the record is delivered to the party.

(c) In no case shall a petition for review of a decision described in subdivision (a) be filed later than one hundred eighty days after the decision is announced or reconsideration is rejected, whichever is later.

The Commission asked the staff to consider whether the one-year limitations period of Government Code Section 19815.8 should be preserved, as requested by Mr. Bassoff. **The staff recommends preserving it**, because Section 19815.8 is closely similar to Section 19630 which the Commission has decided to preserve.

### **§ 1123.710. Applicability of rules of practice for civil actions**

- At the May meeting, the Commission asked the staff to consider whether the five-day extension of time in Code of Civil Procedure Section 1013(a) where notice is mailed applies to the draft statute. Section 1013(a) provides in part that:

any period of notice and any right or duty to do any act or make any response within any period or on a date certain after the service of the document, which time period or date is prescribed by statute or rule of court, shall be extended five days, upon service by mail, if the place of address is within the State of California, 10 days if the place of address is outside the State of California but within the United States, and 20 days if the place of address is outside the United States, but the extension shall not apply to extend the time for filing notice of intention to move for new trial, notice of intention to move to vacate judgment pursuant to Section 663a, or notice of appeal. This extension applies in the absence of a specific exception provided for by this section or other statute or rule of court. . . .

- The staff made clear in Section 1123.710 that Section 1013(a) does not apply, with the hope of drawing comment. Section 1013 has been held not to apply to administrative mandamus to review local agency action under Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. *Tielsch v. City of Anaheim*, 160 Cal. App. 3d 576, 206 Cal. Rptr. 740 (1984). It is unclear whether Section 1013 applies to administrative mandamus to review state agency action under Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, *California Administrative Mandamus*, *supra*, § 7.4, at 242, but it is “reasonably well settled that section 1013 does not extend statutes of limitation.” *Tielsch v. City of Anaheim*, *supra*, at 578.

- Under the draft statute, the rules for determining the last date on which a petition for review may be filed are complex. Section 1123.640 requires a petition for review of a decision of a state agency in an adjudicative proceeding, and of a local agency in a proceeding under the formal adjudication provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, to be filed not later than 30 days after the decision is effective or after the agency gives the required notice to the parties, whichever is later. Section 1123.650 requires a petition for review of all other decisions to be filed not later than 90 days after the decision is announced or the required notice is given. Section 1123.640 extends the time while a stay is in effect or while a party seeks reconsideration, but in no case may the petition be filed later than 180 days after the decision is effective. Section 1123.650 extends the time while a

party seeks reconsideration but, unless revised as suggested above, makes no mention of the effect of a stay. In no case may the petition be filed later than 180 days after the decision is announced or reconsideration is rejected, whichever is later. During a stay or while a party seeks reconsideration, it will be impossible to know the last day to petition for review. If delay because of mailing is thought to impose an unacceptably short time to petition for review, the staff would prefer to change the 30-day time limit to 35 days, rather than applying the extension provisions of Section 1013(a). **The staff recommends the Commission approve the provision in Section 1123.710 making Section 1013(a) inapplicable to the limitations periods in Sections 1123.640 and 1123.650.**

#### **§ 1123.720. Stay of agency action**

The State Bar Committee on Administration of Justice supports this section.

- The Department of General Services says it would “assist the public contracting community” to have a 30-day time limit for requesting a stay of a contract under the Public Contract Code. The Polaroid Corporation also asks for a short limitations period. **The staff would add the following two sections to the Public Contract Code:**

10290.2. Notwithstanding Section 1123.720 of the Code of Civil Procedure, application for a stay of an award, implementation, or performance of a contract under this chapter shall be made not later than 30 days after issuance of a decision by a protest hearing officer.

12114. Notwithstanding Section 1123.720 of the Code of Civil Procedure, application for a stay of an award, implementation, or performance of a contract under this chapter shall be made not later than 30 days after issuance of a decision by a protest hearing officer.

The staff consulted with Kathleen Yates, Staff Counsel for the Department of General Services, in drafting this language.

The Polaroid Corporation is concerned that subdivisions (e) and (f), permitting an appellate court to order that agency action is or is not stayed during an appeal from superior court, has no guidelines for the appellate court to exercise this authority. However, this merely continues language in the administrative mandamus statute, Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5. Moreover, the draft statute contemplates that procedural rules such as these will

be provided by Judicial Council rule. See Section 1123.710. **The staff thinks this language is satisfactory as drafted.**

The Polaroid Corporation would revise subdivision (f) to say agency action is stayed “if an appeal is taken from a final order granting of relief by the superior court.” However, some interlocutory orders may be appealed. See Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1; 9 B. Witkin, *California Procedure Appeals* § 43, at 66 (3d ed. 1985). The draft statute does not prescribe or affect rules for appeal. **The staff thinks this language is satisfactory as drafted.**

The Polaroid Corporation suggests a provision preventing a trial court from staying an award of a public contract until final judgment on judicial review. Under existing law, the trial court has discretion to stay agency action before final judgment if it is not “against the public interest.” Code Civ. Proc. 1094.5(g). Section 1123.720 continues this discretion, and says a stay may be granted only if it “will not substantially threaten the public health, safety, or welfare.” **The staff would preserve trial court discretion to grant a stay before final judgment.**

#### **§ 1123.730. Type of relief**

Section 1123.730 gives the court broad authority to grant appropriate relief, except that for a state agency adjudication subject to the new Government Code provisions including the administrative adjudication bill of rights, relief is limited to a “judgment either commanding the agency to set aside the decision or denying relief.” The Department of Health Services wants the narrower remedy to apply to all its adjudications. Section 1123.730(c) does this as drafted. **We would make this clear by adding the following to the Comment:** “Subdivision (c) applies to state agency adjudications subject to Government Code Sections 11400-11470.50. These provisions apply to all state agency adjudications unless specifically excepted. Gov’t Code § 11410.20 and Comment.”

#### **§ 1123.820. Contents of administrative record**

- Section 1123.820(d) permits the court to require the agency to add to the administrative record its reasons for its action as needed for proper review. Herb Bolz of the Office of Administrative Law says this provision should not apply to review of rulemaking. Government Code Section 11347.3 has a detailed statement of what is required in a rulemaking file, and requires an affidavit of an agency official that the record is complete and “the date upon which the record was closed.” Mr. Bolz says the rulemaking file ought not to be supplemented,

because the agency should be required to give a complete statement of reasons for proposing a regulation at the outset of the rulemaking proceeding, and should not be allowed to add material to the record at a later date. **The staff has no objection to this proposal, and would revise Section 1123.820 as follows:**

(d) If an explanation of reasons for the agency action is not otherwise included in the administrative record, the court may require the agency to add to the administrative record for judicial review a brief explanation of the reasons for the agency action to the extent necessary for proper judicial review. This subdivision does not apply to judicial review of state agency rulemaking under the Administrative Procedure Act, Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

The County Counsels' Association is concerned this provision may permit a court to require a local agency to explain why it did or did not adopt an ordinance. The staff is recommending above that the draft statute not apply to judicial review of local agency ordinances.

#### **§ 1123.830. Preparation of record**

Mr. Bolz says the requirement in Section 1123.830 that the record be prepared by the agency on request of the petitioner for review does not quite fit for rulemaking where the record is already complete at the time of review. **The staff would add the following to the Comment:**

Although subdivision (a) requires the agency to prepare the record on request of the petitioner for review, in state agency rulemaking under the Administrative Procedure Act, the file is already complete at the time of review. See Gov't Code § 11347.3.

#### **§ 1123.840. Disposal of administrative record**

Mr. Bolz suggests we add something like the following to the Comment. **The staff has no objection:**

Rulemaking records should be carefully safeguarded by the agency. Concerning retention of rulemaking records by the Secretary of State, see Gov't Code §§ 11347.3, 12223.5, 14755 [Senate Bill 1507].

### **§ 1123.850. New evidence on judicial review**

- Section 1123.850(a) says that, if there is relevant evidence that could not in the exercise of reasonable diligence have been produced in the administrative proceeding or was improperly excluded, the court may remand to the agency for reconsideration in light of that evidence. Mr. Bolz is concerned this might permit a court to reopen a completed rulemaking proceeding, contrary to Government Code Section 11347.3 and *Western States Petroleum Ass'n v. Superior Court*, 9 Cal. 4th 559, 578, 888 P.2d 1268, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 139, 149 (1995), a case involving judicial review of state agency rulemaking. Mr. Bolz would codify the requirement in *Western States* that the evidence the agency may consider on remand must have been in existence before the agency made its decision. Otherwise a petitioner for review might be able to allege later-discovered evidence and thus finality might never be assured. See *Western States*, *supra*. **The staff would add this limitation:**

1123.850. (a) If the court finds that there is relevant evidence that was in existence at the time of the agency proceedings and that, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have been produced or that was improperly excluded in the agency proceedings, it may enter judgment remanding the case for reconsideration in the light of that evidence. Except as provided in this section, the court shall not admit the evidence on judicial review without remanding the case.

Mr. Bolz would also revise the Comment to say the reasonable diligence provision should be “very” narrowly construed. **The staff has no objection, since this is the language used in *Western States*.**

### **§ 1123.940. Proceedings in forma pauperis**

- Section 1123.940 requires the agency to pay for the transcript if the petitioner is proceeding in forma pauperis. This continues existing provisions in the administrative mandamus statute for adjudication, and generalizes them to apply to judicial review of all forms of agency action. The County Counsels' Association is concerned this will impose significant new costs on local government. Cf. *Rohnert Park v. Superior Court*, 146 Cal. App. 3d 420, 193 Cal. Rptr. 33 (1983) (forma pauperis statute and rules do not require free reporter's transcript on appeal). We prefer to avoid provisions in the draft statute that will have significant fiscal implications. **The staff recommends continuing existing**

**law by limiting this provision to adjudication, and not extending it to agency action now reviewed by traditional mandamus:**

1123.940. Notwithstanding any other provision of this article, if the petitioner has proceeded pursuant to Section 68511.3 of the Government Code and the Rules of Court implementing that section and if the transcript is necessary to a proper review of the ~~administrative proceedings~~ an adjudicative proceeding, the cost of preparing the transcript shall be borne by the agency.

#### SELECTED CONFORMING REVISIONS

**Gov't Code § 11350 (amended). Judicial declaration on validity of regulation**

Mr. Bolz suggested we make clear that “regulation” as used in Government Code Section 11350 means a duly adopted regulation, and does not include such things as an underground regulation. He says this has been the historic interpretation of Section 11350, and is clear from other language in Section 11350. The staff discussed this with Mr. Bolz, and concluded that this would not affect judicial review since, under the draft statute, all standards of general application are reviewable, subject to limitations such as the ripeness requirement. **The staff believes this would be better addressed in the Commission’s rulemaking study, rather than in the judicial review draft.**

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. Murphy  
Staff Counsel



Law Revision Commission

RECEIVED

AUG 2 1996

File: \_\_\_\_\_

State of California  
Office of the Attorney General  
Daniel E. Lungren  
Attorney General

July 31, 1996

California Law Revision Commission  
4000 Middlefield Road  
Suite D-2  
Palo Alto, CA 94303-4739

RE: Commission's May 1996 Revised Tentative Recommendation:  
Judicial Review of Agency Action

Dear Commission Members:

Thank you for this opportunity to offer my views on the May 1996 Revised Tentative Recommendation, which is currently before the Commission.

Although, as discussed below, I retain the concern expressed in my comments on earlier Commission drafts that a total overhaul of the judicial review statutes may not be prudent or necessary, I strongly support the recommendation that independent judgment review of state agency fact-finding be eliminated. (Section 1123.430). Since state agency hearings will soon be subject to the procedural fairness requirements of the new Administrative Procedure Act, it is appropriate to afford the factual findings of these agencies some degree of deference. Substantial evidence review provides this deference without abdicating the judiciary's responsibility to curb abuses.

Moreover, the current system is less than rational. Various decisions - disability determinations being one example - are subject to independent judgment review when made by a constitutional agency, and substantial evidence review when made by other agencies. The current system also generates unnecessary litigation due to the shifting and blurred judicial definitions of "fundamental vested right" (which triggers independent judgment review).

Finally, all other states, and the federal government, use some form of substantial evidence review, and have operated fairly and effectively using that test. California's system should likewise operate fairly and effectively without independent judgment review of state agency fact-finding.

I suggest one technical change. The recommendation proposes that the independent judgment test be retained where an agency changes an Office of Administrative Hearings Administrative Law Judge's finding of fact. (Section 1123.430, subdivision (b).) The recommendation's language should more clearly state that independent review would only apply to the changed finding; unchanged findings would still be reviewed under the substantial evidence test.<sup>1</sup> Increased clarity is needed because the introduction to the recommendation may be read, erroneously, as stating that if any finding of fact is changed, all findings are reviewed under the independent judgment test. (See May 1996 Revised Tentative Recommendation, p. 16, lines 17-20.) Applying independent judgment review to all findings in such a case, however, makes no sense; unaltered findings should be afforded the deference of the substantial evidence test.

In addition, I continue to believe that changes in current law regarding venue and standing are warranted. I prefer the Commission's original approach to venue, under which state agency decisions would be reviewed in Sacramento, or, where representation is provided by my office, in counties where such an office is located. Administrative law, especially as it pertains to state agency practices, is highly specialized. Fair, efficient and consistent application of the law is promoted by assigning these cases to courts that are familiar with this area of the law. I likewise continue to believe that both the current law and the Commission's proposed revisions regarding standing (see section 1123.210, et seq.) are too broad. I suggest that the narrower federal approach, which includes the requirement that a litigant be injured in fact, would benefit the California courts and public.

---

<sup>1</sup>Adding the following underlined words would accomplish this:


"Notwithstanding subdivision (a), the standard for judicial review of a determination of fact made by an administrative law judge employed by the Office of Administrative Hearings that is changed by the agency head is the independent judgment of the court whether the agency's determination of that particular fact is supported by the weight of the evidence."

July 31, 1996

Finally, I remain concerned that it may not be wise to enact an omnibus approach to judicial review. Revamping procedures which have been in place for over 50 years will no doubt lead to confusion and litigation as the new laws are implemented. It is not clear that the benefits of omnibus changes justify those costs.

As before, I appreciate your consideration of these views.

Sincerely,



DANIEL E. LUNGREN  
Attorney General

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

**OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS**501 J STREET, SUITE 230  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814(916) 445-4926  
(916) 323-6439 (FAX)Law Revision Commission  
RECEIVED

MAY 29 1996

File: \_\_\_\_\_

May 28, 1996

Mr. Nathaniel Sterling  
Executive Secretary  
California Law Revision Commission  
4000 Middlefield Road, Suite D-2  
Palo Alto, CA 94303-4739

Dear Nat:

Re: DEFERENCE

This is to amplify on our conversation at the most recent meeting of the Law Revision Commission. I raised the issue of the dual standards relating to agency deference to factual findings made by administrative law judges that presently exists and will continue when the new APA becomes operative on July 1, 1997.

Specifically, Senate Bill 609, Chapter 708 (1995), amended section 2335 of the Business and Professions Code to provide that in cases before the Division of Medical Quality of the Medical Board of California and the California Board of Podiatric Medicine, when considering a proposed decision by an ALJ, these entities "shall give great weight to the findings of fact of the administrative law judge, except to the extent those findings are controverted by new evidence."

At present, there is no similar deference required in other licensing matters heard by the Office of Administrative Hearings. Moreover, as you know Senate Bill 523 contains within the administrative adjudication bill of rights a provision that requires a court to give great weight to findings by the administrative law judge (or any presiding officer) but only those based substantially on the determination of credibility of witnesses and where demeanor assessment is involved and identified in the decision. There is no provision within the formal hearing provisions that requires agencies to defer to findings of fact of any sort made by an ALJ sitting on their behalf.

Presumably, a party affected by the agency's reversal of findings based on credibility assessment would have to resort to judicial review for relief which is very costly and time consuming. The best that can be said of this process is that

## Regional Offices

314 WEST FIRST STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012  
PHONE (213) 897-4642 FAX (213) 897-46481870 BROADWAY, SECOND FLOOR, OAKLAND, CA 94612  
PHONE (510) 286-3943 FAX (510) 873-83171350 FRONT STREET, RM. 8022, SAN DIEGO, CA 92101  
PHONE (619) 526-4476 FAX (619) 526-4418

May 28, 1996

agencies might be reticent to modify affected findings because of the likelihood of reversal in the Superior Court; but this may be small comfort to a party who must absorb the cost of bringing that appeal.

This situation presents at least two problems. The first is the obvious inconsistency in the treatment of factual findings by regulatory agencies in cases which logically should be subject to the same rules in this area. I do not venture an opinion as to whether this rises to the level of an equal protection violation but the issue is one which is almost certain to arise. Second, Senate Bill 523 requires deference by a court and nothing is mentioned about what deference, if any, is owed by the regulatory agency.

My recollection is that this issue was discussed at length by the Law Revision Commission on several occasions with input from a number of counsel representing regulatory agencies, the Attorney General's office, and private counsel representing licensees. On each such occasion, the consensus of the Commission was to adopt what Professor Asimow described as the Universal Camera rule which presumably is set forth in section 11425.50 quoted in part above. However, the discussions always dealt with appropriate deference by agencies and not reviewing courts.

I do not have a specific suggestion for remedying the current inconsistency outlined above and that which will occur on July 1 of next year. I do not advocate any particular deference standard - only that there be consistency among procedures with which regulatory agencies review factual determinations by Administrative Law Judges in formal proceedings governed by the Administrative Procedure Act. I believe the Law Revision Commission is in a unique position to remedy the present situation and that such remedial action is consistent with the Commission's goal of providing greater consistency to administrative adjudication.

Thank you for consideration of this issue. If you have questions or need clarification, please call or write me.

Very truly yours,



KARL S. ENGEMAN  
Director

KSE:sw

000 6

TO: Bob Murphy

Date 22 August 1996

RECEIVED  
AUG 23 1996

TO: Bob Murphy

Date 22 August 1996

Law Revision Commission

RECEIVED

AUG 23 1996

FROM: Herb Bolz, OAL

File: \_\_\_\_\_

RE: Judicial Review TR--Article 8 "Record for Judicial Review"

### Section 1123.820(d)

Add a sentence stating that this provision (drawn from the law governing administrative adjudication) *does not apply* to state agency rulemaking proceedings conducted pursuant to the APA. In current law, agencies subject to the rulemaking part of the APA are required to prepare a statement of reasons in support of each rulemaking. This statement of reasons--part of the administrative record prepared in support of a proposed regulation--is correctly specified in subdivision (b) as the APA rulemaking file.

It is not desirable to permit this record to be supplemented for two reasons. First, the rulemaking system is designed so that the adopting agency must lay its cards on the table at the outset of the rulemaking proceeding: it must state its reasons for proposing the regulation in the *initial* statement of reasons. Government Code section 11346.2(b). This not only encourages the agency to think through the problem carefully but also assists the public in analyzing and commenting upon the proposed regulation.

Second, the final administrative record is designed to be comprehensive, especially where the rationale for an adopted regulation is concerned. At the conclusion of the rulemaking process, just prior to submission to OAL, the adopting agency prepares the updated *final* statement of reasons for inclusion in the rulemaking file. It does not seem logical to permit a court to allow an agency to add material to such a record. Such a relaxed supplementation policy would tend to detract from the idea that the rulemaking process should be the "main event"--that all significant supporting and opposing reasons and evidence should be brought forward *in the rule adoption process*--not held back for use in litigation, if necessary.

### Section 1123.830

This section explains clearly how to prepare the record of an *adjudicatory* proceeding. However, the section may muddy the water insofar as a *rulemaking* record is concerned. As noted in 1123.820(b), Government Code section

11347.3 mandates that, for regulations adopted pursuant to the APA, the administrative record be prepared and closed prior to submission of the regulatory package to OAL. Thus, it seems anomalous for 1123.820 (a)(2) to state that "the administrative record shall be *prepared* by the agency" (emphasis added) following the request of a petitioner.

We suggest that either the text or comment (or both) of 1123.820 be supplemented to make clearer how the section applies when a petitioner files a court challenge to a state agency regulation adopted per the APA.

Note that Government Code section 11347.3(c) states that the rulemaking record "shall be made available by the agency to the public, and to the courts on connection with the review of the regulation."

#### **Section 1123.840**

OAL and the Attorney General have recommend that rulemaking records be permanently retained, because litigation concerning a regulation may occur at any time. Even repealed regulations may continue to govern the disposition of earlier transactions and events.

Current legislation sponsored by the law librarians is seeking to ensure that all rulemaking records are permanently retained by the Secretary of State.

Thus, it would probably be a good idea to mention in the comment to 1123.840 that rulemaking records must be carefully safeguarded. If a rulemaking agency makes the mistake of forwarding the only existing copy of a rulemaking file to a court, it would be best if the court did not destroy what might be an irreplaceable document.

#### **Section 1123.850**

We suggest replacing subdivision (a) of section 1123.850 with the following, in order (1) to more fully reflect the holding in WSPA (9 Cal.4th at 578) and (2) to avoid adversely affecting the finality of quasi-legislature rulemaking proceedings. As pointed out at p. 578 of WSPA, we want to inter alia avoid creating a situation in which a party opposed to an adopted regulation can go to

court repeatedly to obtain an order "reopening the rulemaking proceedings."

new language

(a) The court may enter judgment remanding the case for reconsideration in light of extra-record evidence if the court finds that all of the following conditions have been met:

(1) [the evidence is relevant,] \*\*NB: this item is intended to reflect the discussion in WSPA at pp. 570-74; we are not certain whether or not it needs to be included in the text of this section.\*\*

(2) the evidence existed before the agency made its decision, and,

(3) it was not possible in the exercise of reasonable diligence to present this evidence to the agency before the decision was made [so that it could be considered and included in the administrative record].

Comment

Third sentence in comment. Add the word "very" in front of "narrowly construed"--following WSPA, 9 Cal.4th at 578.

TO: Bob Murphy

Date 28 August 1996

FROM: Herb Bolz, OAL

Law Revision Commission  
RECEIVED

AUG 28 1996

RE: Judicial Review TR-second set of suggestions

File: \_\_\_\_\_

**Section 1120(a)(1)**

Change "executive department" to "executive branch." Branch is clearer. See p. 32 of exhibits to Memo 96-38 (OAL letter suggesting replacement of "department" in Government Code section 11342).

**Section 1121.290**

If you pull out subdivision (a) as you mentioned earlier, we suggest that you retain the word "statement" in (b), following the MAPA section. We think that the objections made to the word "statement" reflect a misunderstanding of the intended scope of the new statute. The comment to section 1121.240 states that "there are no exclusions from [the] all-encompassing definition" of "agency action." Thus, if an agency action does not fall within the term "rule," it is nonetheless covered by the broad definition of "agency action" in section 1121.40, and subject to judicial review if the statutory limitations are satisfied.

**Section 1123.240**

The text contains two subdivision (a)'s. The comment refers to (b)(1) and (b)(2), but the text lacks such subdivisions.

**Section 1123.310**

New comment paragraph 3 suggested:

This chapter does not require that a person seeking judicial review of a rule exhaust administrative remedies by participating in the rulemaking proceeding on which the rule is based. See section 1123.330 (judicial review of rulemaking). However, this chapter does prohibit judicial review of (1) proposed regulations (section 1123.130), (2) regulations that have been preliminarily adopted, but are not yet final (section 1123.120), and (3) adopted regulations that have not yet been applied (section 1123.130).

### Section 1123.330(a)

Article 3 should expressly state that "a petitioner for judicial review of a rule need not have participated in the rulemaking proceeding on which the rule is based." Asimow I (Standing and Timing), n. 27; Model Act sec. 5-107(1). The current subdivision (a) does not clearly address this issue; the comment does not refer either to (1) the Model Act section or (2) generally to the need to broadly exempt challenges to regulations from the exhaustion requirement. Section 1123.350(b)(3) touches upon one aspect of the rulemaking/exhaustion issue, but does not seem to be either clear or broad enough.

One possible way of fixing the problem would be to revise section 1123.330 as follows:

1123.330. (a) A person may obtain judicial review of rulemaking notwithstanding the person's failure to either participate in the rulemaking proceeding upon which the rule is based or to petition the agency promulgating the rule for, or otherwise seek, amendment, repeal, or reconsideration of the rule after it has become final.

### Section 1123.450

#### First Issue

The final sentence in paragraph 1 of the comment reads "Cf. Federal APA sec. 701(a)(2)."

It would be helpful to also provide the U. S. Code citation. Many California attorneys reading the comment may not otherwise know how to quickly find this provision of federal law.

Having devoted time to reading through the entire Tentative Recommendation, including comments, I discovered earlier this month that the tenth paragraph of the comment to section 1120, the first section in the new chapter, contains an explanation of what is meant by "Federal APA" and a U.S. Code citation. I had not previously been aware of this Law Revision convention.

Either of two approaches would make this "Federal APA" reference more user friendly. First, add the U.S. cite to each comment. Or, second, refer readers back to the tenth paragraph of the comment to section 1120.

### Second Issue

On page 47, you ask whether subdivision (b) should be retained. We recommend keeping it. It helps to clarify some complex issues.

### **Section 1123.460**

Subdivision (a) appears to encompass failure to comply with required *rulemaking* procedures. The third paragraph of the comment states that the court decides how much deference to given the "agency's determination of appropriate procedures." This appears to reject the holding of the California Court of Appeal that an agency's determination that it was *not* required to follow APA rulemaking procedures was of "no significance." *Engelmann v. State Board of Education* (1992) 2 Cal.App.4th 47, 56 & 59. Cf. *Grier v. Kizer* (1990) 219 Cal.App.3d 422, 434 (OAL determination that agency rule is subject to rulemaking APA is entitled to great weight because OAL is agency charged with enforcement and interpretation of APA).

We suggest revising section 1123.460 to make clear that the procedures referred to are limited to procedures that are part of one particular agency's enabling act or regulations.

Paragraph 1 of the comment states this section "codifies existing law," but then proceeds to cite two *federal* authorities. We suggest that *Engelmann* and *Grier* exemplify existing *California* law insofar we are dealing with interpretation of the rulemaking APA by state regulatory agencies, and that these cases be cited in the comment.

As currently written, section 1123.460 appears to be a significant change in existing law, one which will affect all persons regulated by California state agencies. If such a change is considered desirable, we suggest that the issue be highlighted in a future Commission document and that input be solicited from private sector parties.

#### **Government Code Section 11350**

We believe that this section was intended to apply solely to judicial review of duly adopted regulations (adopted pursuant to the APA). See, for instance, the clear reference to the rulemaking file prescribed by the APA in subdivision (b). We suggest that it be made clear that section 11350 applies solely to duly adopted regulations. Sections 1121.240 and 1121.290 make clear that agency rules that have not been duly adopted are subject to judicial review under the new statute.

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES**

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND APPEALS

923 12TH STREET, SUITE 201

SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

(916) 322-5603

(916) 323-4477 (FAX)

Law Revision Commission  
RECEIVED

JUL 22 1996

File: \_\_\_\_\_

July 18, 1996

Nathaniel Sterling  
Executive Secretary  
California Law Revision Commission  
4000 Middlefield Road, Room D-1  
Palo Alto, CA 94303-4739

Subject: Comments of Department of Health Services, Office of Administrative Hearings and Appeals, on the tentative recommendation entitled "Judicial Review of Agency Action" (May 1996 draft)

Dear Mr. Sterling:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the latest draft of the recommendation, which is of significant importance to this Office. Before moving on to specific items, I would like to reiterate once again that, overall, this recommendation is a big step in the right direction, with significant improvements over current law.

Our specific comments relate to sections 1123.240, 1123.430, and 1123.730. The concern relating to each section arises from the same issue. Each section assumes that the only formal adjudicatory hearings conducted by state agencies are under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) and/or conducted exclusively before the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH). That presents a problem for this Office, which conducts formal adjudicatory proceedings which are not under the APA, as well as APA proceedings which are not before OAH.

Our formal adjudicatory proceedings have all of the formality of APA proceedings, but because they involve audits and rate setting, the procedural steps of the APA do not fit them. For example, the basic document on which the case proceeds may be a "Statement of Disputed Issues" filed by the provider of services after an audit report has been issued, instead of an Accusation. It is therefore not likely that these proceedings will ever use all of the APA procedures, even under the new APA.

Our APA proceedings are heard here rather than at OAH because the Department of Health Services desires to have shorter time lines for the setting of cases for hearing than OAH is able to accommodate. Also, we believe that having Administrative Law Judges with considerable subject matter expertise hear these cases is very beneficial.

Mr. Sterling  
Page Two  
July 18, 1996

Against this background, we discuss the individual sections.

Section 1123.240: As this Department previously commented, there should be no right of court review of a formal adjudicative proceeding except at the request of a party to the proceeding. This suggestion was accepted as valid. However, the solution was to limit judicial review to the parties only in cases to review APA proceedings. As discussed above, this presents a problem for those of our cases which have all of the formality of APA proceedings but cannot be fit into the full APA procedural framework.

Our suggestion to remedy this problem is the following:  
Instead of the currently proposed subsection 1123.240(a),  
substitute the following language:

"(a) The person is a party to a proceeding to which Article 6 (commencing with Section 11425.10) of Chapter 4.5 of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code applies."

This is a reference to the Administrative Adjudication Bill of Rights. It is very likely that any truly formal adjudication will use the Bill of Rights as a part of the applicable procedure, even if the more technical procedural portions of the APA are not used. This more narrow reference to the APA would ensure that the types of proceedings with which we are concerned do not fall through the procedural cracks on judicial review.

Section 1123.430: We suggest removing "employed by the Office of Administrative Hearings" after the words "administrative law judge." There is no technical or equitable reason why the same rule should not apply if the Administrative Law Judge is employed by the agency itself. This Office uses precisely the same (and sometimes even stricter) protocols for handling of Proposed Decisions (to be adopted or alternated by the Director) as does OAH. The various Directors of this Department have certainly consistently received counselling that courts look with extreme disfavor on fact finding by persons who had no opportunity to see the witnesses. The public would not likely accept the result which is inadvertently created by the current language -- that an agency can have the benefit of the more protective standard if it uses an in-house Administrative Law Judge rather than one employed by OAH.

Mr. Sterling  
Page Three  
July 18, 1996

Section 1123.730: Subsection (c) limits the type of relief that can be granted on judicial review in APA proceedings more narrowly than in other proceedings. We believe that the narrower standard should apply to all proceedings in which individual rights are formally adjudicated, whether or not the exact procedure of the APA is used. That is the current law, and the comment does not suggest a basis for changing the current law in this area.

Perhaps here, also, a reference to the Administrative Adjudication Bill of Rights instead of to the full APA would be a useful device for avoiding too narrow an interpretation. Certainly, the current language would produce very awkward results, allowing some of our final decisions, which are currently reviewable only under Code of Civil Procedure (CCP) section 1094.5 to be reviewed as if they were "ordinary" mandate cases under CCP section 1085.

Thank you for your consideration of these points, which are of significant importance to this Office and to the Department of Health Services in general.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Elisabeth C. Brandt', with a large, stylized 'X' at the end.

Elisabeth C. Brandt  
Chief Administrative Law Judge

# County Counsels' Association of California

---

**Ruth Sorensen**

*Executive Director, County Counsels' Association of California*

*Coordinator, Litigation Coordination Program, California State Association of Counties*

Law Revision Commission  
RECEIVED

AUG 26 1996

August 21, 1996

File: \_\_\_\_\_

California Law Revision Commission  
4000 Middlefield Road  
Suite D-2  
Palo Alto, CA 94303-4739

**RE: Commission's May 1996 Revised Tentative Recommendation  
"Judicial Review of Agency Action"**

Dear Commission Members:

This is to submit some preliminary comments on behalf of the California County Counsels' Association on the May 1996 Revised Tentative Recommendation on "Judicial Review of Agency Action", and to request that consideration by the Commission of this proposal be deferred to allow a fuller examination of its impact on local government.

The California County Counsels Association is comprised of the chief civil attorneys for the 58 counties in the State. The members of the Association are directly interested in litigation and legislation which would affect the judicial review of legislative, quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial, and administrative actions of county government. The Association only recently became aware of the Law Review Commission's consideration of a complete rewrite of the provisions for the judicial review of State and local agency actions. A Committee of the Association has preliminarily reviewed the current proposal and has major concerns regarding the scope and magnitude of the changes which would be made in the judicial review of the actions of local government if the proposal became law. These concerns are discussed below.

The stated objective of the Commission is to recommend "that the archaic judicial review system that has evolved over the years be replaced by a simple and straightforward statute." Certainly, some of the procedural remedies such as certiorari and prohibition are archaic and arcane in nature, and a consolidation of those procedures with more familiar procedures would simplify the practice of law. However, the simple "one size fits all" approach of the current proposal for all types of legislative, quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial, and administrative actions of local government would at best create rather than eliminate confusion, and at worst would result in a separation of powers violation of the Constitutional legislative authority of counties and cities. The proposal fails to recognize that cities and counties have not only quasi-legislative power like a State agency in the adoption of regulations, but that cities and counties also are granted pure legislative power by the California Constitution to adopt laws. Article XI, Section 7

of the California Constitution empower cities and counties to "make and enforce within its limits all local, police, sanitary, and other ordinances, and regulations not in conflict with general laws". Charter cities are granted broader authority by Article XI, Section 5 of the California Constitution to adopt local laws in conflict with State law as long as the subject matter is a municipal affair rather than one of statewide concern. *Johnson v. Bradley* (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 389; *DeVita v. County of Napa* (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 763. The California Supreme Court has broadly construed the constitutional grant of police power to cities and counties, and indicated that the local legislative authority is as inclusive as that which may be exercised by the State Legislature. *Birkenfeld v. City of Berkeley* (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 129, 140. When cities and counties are exercising their legislative authority, it would be just as improper to subject those legislative acts to the judicial review procedures and standards of the current proposal as it would be to attempt to apply those requirements to the adoption of statutes by the State Legislature.

The blurring of the distinction between the judicial review of local legislative acts (i.e. the adoption of ordinances) and of State quasi-legislative acts (i.e. the adoption of regulations by a State agency) and quasi-judicial decisions results from the following provisions of the current proposal:

1. "Rule" is defined in Section 1121.290 to include both regulations and ordinances. "Agency action" is defined in Section 1121.240 to include both the adoption or failure to adopt any rule or decision. Accordingly, whenever the term "rule" or "agency action" is used in the various statutory provisions it includes the local legislative act of adopting or failing to adopt an ordinance. This is contrary to the commonly understood meaning of "rule" and fails to distinguish clearly between the different procedures and standards of judicial review which apply to legislative as opposed to quasi-legislative and other types of acts.

2. An "independent judgment" test with "appropriate" deference is established in Section 1123.420 for all types of agency actions, including the adoption of or failure to adopt ordinances. This independent judgment test is stated to expressly include claims that the adoption or failure to adopt an ordinance was based on an incomplete determination of the issues by the agency, and claims that there was an erroneous application of the law to the facts by the agency. Litigation would be likely to ensue to determine whether these independent judgment provisions have displaced the abuse of discretion standard used by courts for many decades for the review of legislative acts and whether any such change would result in a violation of the separation of powers between the judicial and the legislative branches of government. *California Teachers Assn. v. Ingwersen* (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 860, 866-867.

3. The proposed provision in Section 1123.820(d) authorizing a Court to require a brief explanation of reasons for the adoption or failure to adopt an ordinance also invites judicial encroachment into the legislative power of cities and counties.

4. The Comment under Section 1123.450 states that a "Court can still legitimately review the rationality of legislative fact-finding in light of the evidence in the whole record". This has never been the law for legislative acts as opposed to quasi-legislative acts. Under existing law, the determination of the issue whether the exercise of legislative authority is arbitrary and

capricious, which is the general standard for judicial review of ordinances and statutes, is not confined to the record of the legislative proceeding nor is legislative fact-finding generally required. *Ensign Bickford Realty Corp. v. City Council of the City of Livermore* (1977) 68 C. A. 3d 467.

5. The requirement of Section 1123.820(a) for the production of an "administrative record" for any "agency action" again ignores the important distinction between legislative and administrative acts. There is no "administrative record" for legislative acts. This is most evident when the legislative power is exercised by the voters through initiative, but is equally true for the adoption of laws by the legislative body. See *Birkenfeld v. City of Berkeley*, *supra*.

6. The allowance by Section 1123.94 of an *in forma pauperis* challenge to regulations and ordinances as well as to decisions, would require agencies to pay for the transcript costs of actions challenging the adoption or alleged failure to adopt ordinances. This could be a significant new mandated cost on local agencies whenever they hold lengthy public hearings on proposed ordinances, and would appear to be an unjustified extension of the existing provision which only requires local agencies to pay for the transcripts of administrative hearings for persons unable to pay for them. Whereas an administrative decision generally only directly affects an individual or a few individuals who may not be able to afford a transcript, the legislative act of adopting an ordinance generally affects a large number of persons so that it is highly unlikely that a publicly financed transcript would be necessary to provide a reasonable opportunity for interested persons to challenge the adoption or alleged failure to adopt an ordinance or regulation.

Due to the shortness of the time the County Counsels' Association has had to review this proposal, this letter does not contain a complete statement of the comments and specific recommendations of the Association on this proposal. It is our understanding that the League of California Cities has also not completed their review of the proposal. It is therefore requested that the Commission delay further consideration of the current proposal to allow additional review by local government and to further consider the impacts of the proposal on the judicial review of local government actions, including legislative acts.

Sincerely,



Ruth Sorensen

cc: Joanne Speers, League of California Cities  
Daniel L. Siegel, Attorney General's Office  
County Counsels



THE COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE  
**THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA**

555 FRANKLIN STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4498  
(415) 561-8200

Law Revision Commission  
RECEIVED

AUG 27 1996

File: \_\_\_\_\_

August 23, 1996

BY FACSIMILE

California Law Revision Commission  
Attention: Nat Sterling, Executive Secretary  
4000 Middlefield Road, Suite D-2  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Re: California Law Revision Commission's Revised Tentative  
Recommendation on Judicial Review of Agency Action  
(Recommendations")

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Committee on Administration of Justice (CAJ) of the State Bar has considered the Recommendations at several meetings of both the North and South sections. Following are CAJ's views.

1. Petition for Review of Agency Action

CAJ supports replacing the present different methods for seeking judicial review with a single method called Petition for Review of Agency Action, because of the simplicity and uniformity that can result.

2. Standing for Appeal

The provision in the Recommendations that the person seeking review need not have objected below, but rather have some public interest standing or other grounds to bring the proceeding, is beneficial and CAJ supports this.

### **3. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies**

CAJ supports the proposal in the Recommendations to codify existing caselaw on this point.

### **4. Denial of Request for Continuance**

The two sections of CAJ took different positions on whether there should be immediate appeal available where a request for continuance is denied. The North opposes this part of the Recommendations, as the full CAJ had done in 1995, on the ground that the prejudicial effects of having to proceed without continuance can rarely be cured after the matter is heard on its merits. The South supports the Recommendation with the view that it would not have a substantive impact.

### **5. Statute of Limitations for Review of Administrative Adjudication**

The proposed law makes a uniform 30-day limitations period for judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) apply to most state agency adjudications. The 90-day limitations period for local agency adjudications is retained, as are certain other limitations periods which are unique to certain agencies. The proposed law also requires the agency to give written notice to the parties of a date by which review must be sought, or the limitations period is tolled up to 180 days after the decision. CAJ supports the provision because of the written notice requirement and because it believes the uniformity of is desirable.

### **6. Standard of Review**

#### **A. Review of Agency Interpretation of Law**

The Recommendations now would adopt in a "Comment" to the statute a principle that statutory interpretation by an agency within its expertise should be given deference by the courts unless "clearly erroneous". CAJ believes this is inconsistent with the independent judgment test, which CAJ has consistently supported, and therefore opposes the inclusion of the Comment language. CAJ recommends changing the comma after "Court" on line 3, page 32 of the Recommendations, to a semi-colon and deleting the remainder of the sentence starting with the phrase "giving deference to...."

#### **B. Review of Agency Application of Law to Fact**

The Recommendations propose that if there is no dispute of basic facts on the record and the dispute revolves around the application of law to those facts, the agency's determination should be reviewed as a question of law. This in effect provides for independent review of the agency action, and CAJ supports the proposal.

#### **C. Review of Agency Fact Finding**

The Recommendations propose to eliminate independent judgment as a standard for review of agency fact-finding. It would instead require the court to uphold agency findings if supported by "substantial evidence" in the record as a whole.

The Comment to Section 1123.430 (Review of Agency Fact Finding) states the application of the substantial evidence standard as follows:

"If a reasonable person could have made the agency's findings, the court must sustain them. But if the agency head comes to a different conclusion about credibility, then the administrative law judge, the substantiality of the evidence supporting the agency's decision is called into question."

While members voiced some concerns whether constitutional issues would arise in situations where substantial vested rights are affected, CAJ voted to support the proposed change.

#### **D. Review of Agency Exercise of Discretion**

This section concerns the standard of review for action taken by an agency in the exercise of its discretion. The proposed statute sets "abuse of discretion" as the standard. It also provides that to the extent that agency action required the exercise of discretion, based on a determination of fact made or implied by the agency, the substantial evidence standard would apply. The Recommendations state that in reviewing discretionary action, the court would use independent judgment with appropriate deference to decide whether the agency's choice was legally permissible and whether the agency followed legally required procedures. However, the statute itself uses "abuse of discretion" standard.

The Recommendations (and the Comment to Section 1123.450) describe an analysis of "abuse of discretion" as a two-step inquiry: (1) whether the factual underpinnings of a decision are supported by substantial evidence; (2) as to any discretionary action of the agency based on a choice or judgment, whether the agency action is unreasonable, arbitrary or capricious. CAJ supports the proposal, although a number of members suggest that the two-step inquiry be incorporated into the statute itself.

#### **E. Review of Agency Procedure**

Current law requires California courts to use independent judgment on the question whether agency action complies with procedural requirements of California statutes or the Constitution. The Recommendations would have courts continue to use independent judgment on procedural issues, but give deference to agency decisions regarding procedural provisions and statutes or about the propriety of the body making the decision.

CAJ supports the proposal which this appears to codify a requirement of deference to the review of agency procedures, and gives latitude to the court on how much deference to give.

#### **7. Proper Court for Review; Venue**

The proposed law changes the venue requirements from the county where the cause of action arose to include Sacramento County as an additional permissible county when a state agency is involved. For judicial review of local agency action, venue remains in the county of jurisdiction of the agency. CAJ is concerned that actions could be brought by agencies in Sacramento even though there was no contact with the parties or activity involved, and even though it might be distant from the residence of the individual affected. CAJ therefore opposes this proposal in the Recommendations.


#### **8. Stays Pending Review**

The Recommendations propose simplifying the scheme for granting stays by imposing one uniform standard regardless of the type of agency action being reviewed. Several factors, including the public interest and likelihood of success on the merits, as well as the degree to which the applicant for a stay will suffer irreparable injury from denial and the degree to which the grant of a stay would

California Law Revision Commission  
August 23, 1996  
Page 5

harm third parties, are applied. Because this removes the existing difference for stays in medical and certain other cases, CAJ supports the provision.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'D' followed by a long horizontal stroke and a small loop at the end.

Denis T. Rice for the Committee on  
the Administration of Justice

DTR:rkn

062095/f-666666:/36/215386

cc: Curtis E.A. Karnow, Chair  
Robert C. Vanderet, Vice Chair  
Monroe Baer, Staff Attorney

# California Judges Association



301 Howard Street  
Suite 1040  
San Francisco  
California 94105-2252

(415) 495 1999  
(415) 974 1209 Fax

## 1995-1996 Executive Board

Hon. Paul Boland  
*President*  
Hon. Albert P. Dover  
*Vice President*  
Hon. Thomas E. Hollenhorst  
*Vice President*  
Hon. William F. McDonald  
*Secretary Treasurer*  
  
Hon. Ralph E. Brogdon, Jr.  
Hon. Connie M. Callahan  
Hon. David R. Chaffee  
Hon. Warren C. Conklin  
Hon. J. Stephen Czuleger  
Hon. Michael J. Farrell  
Hon. Ralph Flageollet  
Hon. Dwayne Keyes  
Hon. Ann Kough  
Hon. John F. Kraetzer  
Hon. Edward M. Lacy, Jr.  
Hon. Lucy Kelly McCabe  
Hon. Janice McIntyre  
Hon. Alban I. Niles  
Hon. Harkjoon Paik  
Hon. Walter D. Rogers  
Hon. Laurence D. Rubin  
Hon. William H. Stephens  
Hon. Eddie C. Sturgeon  
Hon. Daniel J. Tobin

Constance Dove  
*Executive Director*

September 5, 1996

Nathaniel Sterling  
Executive Secretary  
California Law Revision Commission  
4000 Middlefield Road, Room D-1  
Palo Alto, CA 94303-4739

Law Revision Commission  
RECEIVED

SEP 06 1996

File: \_\_\_\_\_

Re: Judicial Review of Agency Action

Dear Mr. Sterling:

I am responding to your request for review of the above law revision proposal. The proposal was sent to several members of our Civil Law Committee. At this point I have received input from a few judges.

Judge Robert Hess (L.A. Municipal Court) felt that the simplification of mandamus procedures is helpful. He stated that he is not an expert in the field, but believes clarification of these laws is a good idea. Judge Hess also holds high regard for the CLRC generally.

Judge Paul Coffee (San Luis Obispo Superior Court) stated generally that he appreciates and endorses the CLRC mandamus revisions.

Justice Morrison also supported the revision of mandamus laws. He believes the proposed change from independent judgment to substantial evidence in review of state agency actions is a good idea. Justice Morris notes that the Alcoholic Beverage Commission was not included among the various agencies which receive special deference. He understands that the ABC is usually granted such deference along with the other named agencies.

As I mentioned to you, I also support the proposed revisions, having practiced public entity law for several years. I hope this information is helpful. I know the judges would like to be able to provide more in depth critiques but, as you know, their schedules are very demanding. However, I believe their responses indicate that CJA would be supportive of any resulting legislation.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Samuel T. Crump  
Legislative Counsel

**Memorandum**

**Date :** September 5, 1996

**To :** Nathaniel Sterling  
Executive Secretary  
California Law Revision Commission  
4000 Middlefield Road, Room D-1  
Palo Alto CA 94303-4739

**From :** *Kathleen A. Yates, Staff Counsel III*  
**DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES**  
**OFFICE OF LEGAL SERVICES**  
**1325 J STREET, SUITE 1911**  
**SACRAMENTO CA 95814**

**Subject: REVISED TENTATIVE RECOMMENDATION ON JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY ACTION**

Law Revision Commission  
RECEIVED

SEP 06 1996

File: \_\_\_\_\_

On behalf of the Department of General Services (DGS) I would like to provide the Commission with the following comments. The DGS, pursuant to its authority in the Public Contract Code at sections 10343, 10345, 10376 and 10378, conducts non-Administrative Procedure Act (APA) bid protest hearings to review services and consulting service contract awards made by state agencies. Additionally, the DGS is an interested party in the non-APA bid protest hearings conducted by the Board of Control to review contract awards for purchase of commodities, equipment, information technology goods and services, and telecommunications goods and services pursuant to Public Contract Code sections 10306 and 12102.

We have experienced litigation and court review of DGS decisions on protests of other state agency contract awards, as well as litigation and court review of Board of Control decisions on protests of DGS proposed contract awards. Under the current system we have experienced difficulties with the fact that there is no time within which a writ must be filed or a stay of contract implementation must be requested. Based upon this experience we appreciate the time deadline provided in section 1123.640(b)(2) of the Revised Tentative Recommendation for filing of a petition for review. However there is no time deadline for a request of a stay of the agency decision. The stay provisions in section 1123.720 of the Revised Tentative Recommendation do not assist us in the situation where a contract award is made after the resolution of the protest by either the DGS or the Board of Control, then a petition for review is filed and sometime after that a stay of contract implementation is requested. It would assist the public contracting community if there were a deadline by which a complaining party were required to request a stay.

Attached please find suggested language providing a 30 day window in which to request a stay of contract performance in this situation.

Please contact me at ATSS 8-492-5948, or the public number, (916) 322-5948, if you wish to discuss this matter further. Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Attachment

s:\misc\revisi.com

1     **§1123.720. Stay of agency action**

2             1123.720.(a) The filing of a petition for review under this title does not of itself  
3 stay or suspend the operation of any agency action.

4             (b) Subject to subdivisions (g), (h), on application of the petitioner, the reviewing  
5 court may grant a stay of the agency action pending the judgment of the court if it finds  
6 that all of the following conditions are satisfied:

7                 (1) The petitioner is likely to prevail ultimately on the merits.

8                 (2) Without a stay the petitioner will suffer irreparable injury.

9                 (3) The grant of a stay to the petitioner will not cause substantial harm to others.

10                (4) The grant of a stay to the petitioner will not substantially threaten the public  
11 health, safety or welfare.

12             (c) The application for a stay shall be accompanied by proof of service of a copy  
13 of the application on the agency. Service shall be made in the same manner as service  
14 of a summons in a civil action.

15             (d) The court may condition a stay on appropriate terms, including the giving of  
16 security for the protection of parties or others.

17             (e) If an appeal is taken from a denial of relief by the superior court, the agency  
18 action shall not be further stayed except on order of the court to which the appeal is  
19 taken. However, in cases where a stay is in effect at the time of filing the notice of  
20 appeal, the stay is continued by operation of law for a period of 20 days after the filing  
21 of the notice.

22             (f) Except as provided by statute, if an appeal is taken from a granting of relief by  
23 the superior court, the agency action is stayed pending the determination of the appeal  
24 unless the court to which the appeal is taken orders otherwise. Notwithstanding  
25 Section 916, the court to which the appeal is taken may direct that the appeal shall not  
26 stay the granting of relief by the superior court.

27             (g) No stay may be granted to prevent or enjoin the state or an officer of the  
28 state from collecting a tax.


29             (h) *A stay of contract performance must be requested within 30 days after*  
30 *issuance of a decision of a protest hearing officer.*



ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA  
STATE ATTORNEYS AND  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES



PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS  
IN CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT



California Association of  
Professional Scientists

September 11, 1996

Law Revision Commission  
RECEIVED

SEP 16 1996

File: \_\_\_\_\_

California Law Revision Commission  
4000 Middlefield Road, Room D-1  
Palo Alto, CA 94303-1827

Re: Judicial Review of Agency Action

Dear Commission Members:

I am writing on behalf of the Association of California State Attorneys and Administrative Law Judges (ACSA), the Professional Engineers in California Government (PECG), and the California Association of Professional Scientists (CAPS) to express their views concerning the September 1996 Staff Draft Recommendation.

ACSA, PECG, and CAPS represent state employees in their labor relations with the State of California, and regularly deal with the State Personnel Board, the Public Employment Relations Board, the Public Employees' Retirement System, and the Department of Personnel Administration in providing representation to their members.

Section 1123.640 provides that a petition for review of a state agency decision be filed within 30 days after notice of the decision is made. The comment to this section states that the State Personnel Board is exempt from the 30 day limitation period. The time limits found in Government Code Section 19630 will continue to apply to decisions of the State Personnel Board. However, the draft recommendation does not state whether the time limits found in Government Code Section 19815.8 concerning decisions of the Department of Personnel Administration will remain. ACSA, PECG, and CAPS recommend that the time limits found in Government Code Section 19815.8 continue to apply to decisions of the Department of Personnel Administration.


ACSA, PECG, and CAPS are also concerned about the matter of "standing" as provided in Section 1123.230. Section 1123.230 eliminates a taxpayer's action under Code of Civil Procedure Section 526a. As drafted, a person must be able to demonstrate that he/she "will adequately protect the public interest" and must also make a request that an agency correct the action, and

wait at least 30 days for the agency to reply before challenging the agency action. The comment to this section does not indicate how one demonstrates that he/she will adequately protect the public, or why the procedural requirement of making a written request for the agency to correct the action is necessary. If subdivision (a) of Section 1123.230 is satisfied, then a person should have "standing" to pursue an important right affecting the public interest.

The final concern of ACSA, PEGC, and CAPS is the use of the substantial evidence test to review matters involving a fundamental vested right. The court decisions concerning fundamental vested rights recognize the significance of the particular right involved in a given case, and therefore have ruled that decisions must be reviewed by the independent judgment test. The draft recommendation also recognizes this by providing for use of the independent judgment test when local agency decisions involve fundamental vested rights. ACSA, PEGC, and CAPS believe that when state agencies make decisions affecting fundamental vested rights, courts should review those decisions by the independent judgment test, especially decisions of the PERS and DPA.

Thank you for consideration of these issues. If you have any questions or need clarification, please contact me.

Very truly yours,



Steven B. Bassoff  
Labor Relations Counsel  
ACSA, PEGC, and CAPS



# POLAROID CORPORATION

PHILIP J. SCARFO  
GENERAL MANAGER  
ID CARD SOLUTIONS

Law Revision Commission  
RECEIVED

TELEPHONE: 617-386-6226  
FAX: 617-386-6335

SEP 16 1996

September 12, 1996

File: \_\_\_\_\_

Nathaniel Sterling  
Executive Secretary  
California Law Revision Commission  
4000 Middlefield Road, Room D-1  
Palo Alto, California 94303-4739

RE: Revised Tentative Recommendation on Judicial Review of Agency Action

Dear Mr. Sterling:

Polaroid Corporation, a vendor and proposed vendor of advanced technology goods and services to various state agencies, wishes to comment on certain legislation which the Commission is considering. We have reviewed and appreciate the comments of the Department of General Services raising issues of concern to the agency primarily responsible for managing the state's acquisition activities. The following comments add additional detail and address issues of concern to vendors, such as Polaroid, who may be awarded contracts by a state agency, successfully defend the award as lawful and appropriate before the Board of Control in a protest hearing conducted pursuant to Public Contract Code section 12102 (h), enter into a contract with the state which compels the vendor immediately to perform and then, months and millions of dollars after commencing performance, face a petition for review and an application to stay, not the Board of Control's decision, but the decision of the contracting agency to award the contract in the first place.

On behalf of Polaroid, we offer the following comments as to proposed section 1123.720 of the Code of Civil Procedure, titled "Stay of Agency Action."

1. Subsection (b) begins with the words "Subject to subdivision (g)." Although "subject to" often has an understood legal meaning, it is awkward, and not quite precise. We suggest that the introductory phrase instead be "Except as provided in subsection."

2. Subsection (e) authorizes the court to which an appeal is taken to impose a stay of agency action, even if the agency prevailed at the trial court level, without setting forth any guidelines by which the appellate court should determine to impose a stay. We suggest that the Commission consider adding requirements that the appellate court conclude that a stay is in the public interest, that a stay will not adversely affect other private parties more than it will help the party in whose favor the stay is issued, and that a stay will issue only upon the appellate court's

-2-


satisfaction that adequate security has been posted or is otherwise available to protect parties who are adversely affected by the stay.

3 Subsection (f) contains awkward language. The introductory language would read better if it said "Except as otherwise provided by statute." Instead of "a granting of relief" which appears in both sentences of subsection (f), we suggest "a final order granting relief." Like subsection (e), this subsection sets forth no standards by which the appellate court is to make its determination. The Commission may wish to add standards providing that the appellate court must find that relief from stay is in the public interest. The Commission also may wish to give an appellate preference to the time within which an appeal will be heard in cases where agency action has been stayed.

4. Vendors have experienced problems with review of agency actions in two other areas. First, the statute of limitations for seeking review of agency action is murky; there needs to be a short and clearly-established statute of limitations. Second, after a protest hearing, the agency and the vendor want to enter their contract and begin work. The contracting process will have great uncertainty if on-going contracts can be halted before a judgment has become final. Thus we suggest that the Commission consider adding a subsection which states that, following the agency decision denying a protest, a performance of a contract may not be stayed base on review of the agency decision denying the protest, until a judgment has become final.

We thank you for your consideration of these points.

Sincerely,

  
Philip J. Scarfo

# JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY ACTION

## CONTENTS

### CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

#### PART 3. OF SPECIAL PROCEEDINGS OF A CIVIL NATURE

CHAPTER 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS . . . . .	27
Article 1. Preliminary Provisions . . . . .	27
§ 1120. Application of title . . . . .	27
§ 1121.110. Conflicting or inconsistent statute controls . . . . .	28
§ 1121.120. Other forms of judicial review replaced . . . . .	29
§ 1121.130. Injunctive relief ancillary . . . . .	29
§ 1121.140. Exercise of agency discretion . . . . .	29
§ 1121.150. Application of new law . . . . .	30
Article 2. Definitions . . . . .	30
§ 1121.210. Application of definitions . . . . .	30
§ 1121.220. Adjudicative proceeding . . . . .	30
§ 1121.230. Agency . . . . .	30
§ 1121.240. Agency action . . . . .	30
§ 1121.250. Decision . . . . .	31
§ 1121.260. Local agency . . . . .	31
§ 1121.270. Party . . . . .	31
§ 1121.280. Person . . . . .	32
§ 1121.290. Rule . . . . .	32
CHAPTER 2. PRIMARY JURISDICTION . . . . .	32
§ 1122.010. Application of chapter . . . . .	32
§ 1122.020. Exclusive agency jurisdiction . . . . .	33
§ 1122.030. Concurrent agency jurisdiction . . . . .	33
§ 1122.040. Judicial review following agency action . . . . .	34
CHAPTER 3. JUDICIAL REVIEW . . . . .	34
Article 1. General Provisions . . . . .	34
§ 1123.110. Requirements for judicial review . . . . .	34
§ 1123.120. Finality . . . . .	34
§ 1123.130. Judicial review of agency rule . . . . .	35
§ 1123.140. Exception to finality and ripeness requirements . . . . .	35
§ 1123.150. Proceeding not moot because penalty completed . . . . .	36
§ 1123.160. Condition of relief . . . . .	36
Article 2. Standing . . . . .	36
§ 1123.210. No standing unless authorized by statute . . . . .	36
§ 1123.220. Private interest standing . . . . .	37
§ 1123.230. Public interest standing . . . . .	38
§ 1123.240. Standing for review of decision in adjudicative proceeding . . . . .	39
Article 3. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies . . . . .	40
§ 1123.310. Exhaustion required . . . . .	40
§ 1123.320. Administrative review of adjudicative proceeding . . . . .	40
§ 1123.330. Judicial review of rulemaking . . . . .	41
§ 1123.340. Exceptions to exhaustion of administrative remedies . . . . .	41
§ 1123.350. Exact issue rule . . . . .	42
Article 4. Standards of Review . . . . .	43
§ 1123.410. Standards of review of agency action . . . . .	43
§ 1123.420. Review of agency interpretation or application of law . . . . .	43

§ 1123.430. Review of agency fact finding . . . . .	46
§ 1123.440. Review of fact finding in local agency adjudication . . . . .	46
§ 1123.450. Review of agency exercise of discretion . . . . .	47
§ 1123.460. Review of agency procedure . . . . .	48
§ 1123.470. Burden of persuasion . . . . .	48
Article 5. Superior Court Jurisdiction and Venue . . . . .	49
§ 1123.510. Superior court jurisdiction . . . . .	49
§ 1123.520. Superior court venue . . . . .	49
Article 6. Petition for Review . . . . .	50
§ 1123.610. Petition for review . . . . .	50
§ 1123.620. Contents of petition for review . . . . .	50
§ 1123.630. Notice to parties of last day to file petition for review . . . . .	50
§ 1123.640. Time for filing petition for review in adjudication of state agency and formal adjudication of local agency . . . . .	51
§ 1123.650. Time for filing petition for review in other adjudicative proceedings. . . . .	52
Article 7. Review Procedure . . . . .	52
§ 1123.710. Applicability of rules of practice for civil actions . . . . .	52
§ 1123.720. Stay of agency action . . . . .	53
§ 1123.730. Type of relief . . . . .	54
§ 1123.740. Jury trial . . . . .	55
Article 8. Record for Judicial Review . . . . .	56
§ 1123.810. Administrative record exclusive basis for judicial review . . . . .	56
§ 1123.820. Contents of administrative record . . . . .	56
§ 1123.830. Preparation of record . . . . .	57
§ 1123.840. Disposal of administrative record . . . . .	58
§ 1123.850. New evidence on judicial review . . . . .	58
Article 9. Costs and Fees . . . . .	60
§ 1123.910. Fee for transcript and preparation and certification of record . . . . .	60
§ 1123.920. Recovery of costs of suit . . . . .	60
§ 1123.930. No renewal or reinstatement of license on failure to pay costs . . . . .	60
§ 1123.940. Proceedings in forma pauperis . . . . .	60
§ 1123.950. Attorney fees in action to review administrative proceeding . . . . .	61
SELECTED CONFORMING REVISIONS . . . . .	62
STATE BAR COURT . . . . .	62
Bus. & Prof. Code § 6089 (added). Inapplicability of Code of Civil Procedure . . . . .	62
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL APPEALS BOARD . . . . .	62
Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090 (amended). Jurisdiction . . . . .	62
Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090.1 (repealed). Writ of review . . . . .	62
Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090.2 (repealed). Scope of review . . . . .	63
Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090.3 (amended). Right to appear in judicial review proceeding . . . . .	63
Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090.4 (amended). Judicial review . . . . .	63
Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090.5 (amended). Courts having jurisdiction . . . . .	64
Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090.6 (repealed). Stay of order . . . . .	64
Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090.7 (amended). Effectiveness of order . . . . .	64
TAXPAYER ACTIONS . . . . .	64
Code Civ. Proc. § 526a (amended). Taxpayer actions . . . . .	64
VALIDATING PROCEEDINGS . . . . .	65
Code Civ. Proc. § 871 (added). Inapplicability of Title 2 of Part 3 . . . . .	65
WRIT OF MANDATE . . . . .	65
Code Civ. Proc. § 1085 (amended). Writ of mandate . . . . .	65
Code Civ. Proc. § 1085.5 (repealed). Action of Director of Food and Agriculture . . . . .	66
Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5 (repealed). Administrative mandamus . . . . .	66
Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6 (repealed). Review of local agency decision . . . . .	69

COMMISSION ON PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE . . . . .	71
Educ. Code § 44945 (amended). Judicial review . . . . .	71
BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES . . . . .	72
Educ. Code § 87682 (amended). Judicial review . . . . .	72
COSTS IN CIVIL ACTIONS RESULTING FROM ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS . . . . .	72
Gov't Code § 800 (repealed). Costs in action to review administrative proceeding . . . . .	72
PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD . . . . .	73
Gov't Code § 3520 (amended). Judicial review of unit determination or unfair practice case . . . . .	73
Gov't Code § 3542 (amended). Review of unit determination . . . . .	74
Gov't Code § 3564 (amended). Judicial review of unit determination or unfair practice case . . . . .	75
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT — RULEMAKING . . . . .	76
Gov't Code § 11350 (amended). Judicial declaration on validity of regulation . . . . .	76
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT — ADJUDICATION . . . . .	77
Gov't Code § 11420.10 (amended). ADR authorized . . . . .	77
Gov't Code § 11523 (repealed). Judicial review . . . . .	78
Gov't Code § 11524 (amended). Continuances . . . . .	79
STATE PERSONNEL BOARD AND DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION . . . . .	80
Gov't Code § 19576.1 (amended). Employee discipline in State Bargaining Unit 5 . . . . .	80
LOCAL AGENCIES . . . . .	81
Gov't Code § 54963 (added). Decision . . . . .	81
ZONING ADMINISTRATION . . . . .	81
Gov't Code § 65907 (amended). Time for attacking administrative determination . . . . .	81
PRIVATE HOSPITAL BOARDS . . . . .	82
Health & Safety Code §§ 1339.62-1339.64 (added). Judicial review . . . . .	82
Article 12. Judicial Review of Decision of Private Hospital Board . . . . .	82
§ 1339.62. Definitions . . . . .	82
§ 1339.63. Judicial review . . . . .	82
§ 1339.64. Standard of review of fact finding . . . . .	82
AGRICULTURAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD . . . . .	83
Lab. Code § 1160.8 (amended). Review of final order of board . . . . .	83
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD . . . . .	84
Lab. Code § 5950 (amended). Judicial review . . . . .	84
Lab. Code § 5951 (repealed). Writ of review . . . . .	84
Lab. Code § 5952 (repealed). Scope of review . . . . .	84
Lab. Code § 5953 (amended). Right to appear in judicial review proceeding . . . . .	85
Lab. Code § 5954 (amended). Judicial review . . . . .	85
Lab. Code § 5955 (amended). Courts having jurisdiction . . . . .	85
Lab. Code § 5956 (repealed). Stay of order . . . . .	86
Lab. Code § 6000 (amended). Undertaking on stay order . . . . .	86
STATE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION . . . . .	86
Pub. Res. Code § 25531.5 (added). Inapplicability of Code of Civil Procedure . . . . .	86
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION . . . . .	87
Pub. Util. Code § 1768 (added). Inapplicability of Code of Civil Procedure . . . . .	87
PROPERTY TAXATION . . . . .	87
Rev. & Tax. Code § 2954 (amended). Assessee's challenge by writ . . . . .	87
Rev. & Tax. Code § 2955 (technical amendment). Recovery of costs by assessee . . . . .	87
Rev. & Tax. Code § 2956 (technical amendment). Precedence for court hearing . . . . .	88
Rev. & Tax. Code § 5140 (amended). Action for refund of property taxes . . . . .	88
STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION . . . . .	88
Rev. & Tax. Code § 7279.6 (amended). Judicial review . . . . .	88
CALIFORNIA UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BOARD . . . . .	89
Unemp. Ins. Code § 1243 (amended). Judicial review . . . . .	89
DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES . . . . .	89
Veh. Code § 13559 (amended). Petition for review . . . . .	89

Veh. Code § 14401 (amended). Statute of limitations on review . . . . .	90
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES . . . . .	90
Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962 (amended). Judicial review . . . . .	90
UNCODIFIED . . . . .	91
Uncodified (added). Severability . . . . .	91
Uncodified (added). Application of new law . . . . .	91

**Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1120-1123.950 (added). Judicial review of agency action**

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) is added to Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure to read:

**TITLE 2. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY ACTION**

**CHAPTER 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS**

**Article 1. Preliminary Provisions**

**§ 1120. Application of title**

1120. (a) Except as provided by statute, this title governs judicial review of agency action of any of the following entities:

(1) The state, including any agency or instrumentality of the state, whether exercising executive powers or otherwise.

(2) A local agency, including a county, city, district, public authority, public agency, or other political subdivision in the state.

(3) A public corporation in the state.

(b) This title does not apply where a statute provides for judicial review of agency action by any of the following means:

(1) Trial de novo.

(2) Action for refund of taxes under Division 2 (commencing with Section 6001) of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

(3) Action under Division 3.6 (commencing with Section 810) of the Government Code, relating to claims and actions against public entities and public employees.

(c) This title does not apply to litigation in which the sole issue is a claim for money damages or compensation and the agency whose action is at issue does not have statutory authority to determine the claim.

(d) This title does not apply to judicial review of a decision of a court.

(e) Except as expressly provided by statute, this title does not apply to judicial review of action of a nongovernmental entity.

**Comment.** Section 1120 makes clear that the judicial review provisions of this title apply to actions of local agencies as well as state government. The term “local agency” is defined in Government Code Section 54951. See Section 1121.260 & Comment. The introductory clause of Section 1120 recognizes that some proceedings are exempted by statute from application of this title. See Bus. & Prof. Code § 6089 (State Bar Court); Gov’t Code § 11420.10 (award in binding arbitration under Administrative Procedure Act); Pub. Res. Code § 25531.5 (Energy Commission); Pub. Util. Code § 1759 (Public Utilities Commission). See also Gov’t Code § 19576.1 (disciplinary decisions not subject to judicial review). This title also does not apply to proceedings where the substantive right originates in the constitution, such as inverse condemnation. See California Government Tort Liability Practice § 2.97, at 181-82 (Cal. Cont. Ed. Bar, 3d ed. 1992). See also Section 1123.160 (condition of relief).

Under subdivision (b)(1), this title does not apply where a statute provides for judicial review by a trial de novo. Such statutes include: Educ. Code §§ 33354 (hearing on compliance with federal law on interscholastic activities), 67137.5 (judicial review of college or university withholding student records); Food & Agric. Code § 31622 (hearing concerning vicious dog); Gov't Code § 53088.2 (judicial review of local action concerning video provider); Lab. Code §§ 98.2 (judicial review of order of Labor Commissioner on employee complaint), 1543 (judicial review of determination of Labor Commissioner involving athlete agent), 1700.44 (judicial review of order of Labor Commissioner involving talent agency); Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605.5 (change of property ownership or new construction); Welf. & Inst. Code § 5334 (judicial review of capacity hearing).

Subdivision (b)(2) exempts from this title actions for refund of taxes under Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, but does not exempt property taxation under Division 1. This is consistent with existing law under which judicial review of a property tax assessment is not by trial de novo, but is based on the administrative record. See *Bret Harte Inn, Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco*, 16 Cal. 3d 14, 544 P.2d 1354, 127 Cal. Rptr. 154 (1976); *DeLuz Homes, Inc. v. County of San Diego*, 45 Cal. 2d 546, 290 P.2d 544 (1955); *Prudential Ins. Co. v. City and County of San Francisco*, 191 Cal. App. 3d 1142, 236 Cal. Rptr. 869 (1987); *Kaiser Center, Inc. v. County of Alameda*, 189 Cal. App. 3d 978, 234 Cal. Rptr. 603 (1987); *Trailer Train Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization*, 180 Cal. App. 3d 565, 225 Cal. Rptr. 717 (1986); *Hunt-Wesson Foods, Inc. v. County of Alameda*, 41 Cal. App. 3d 163, 116 Cal. Rptr. 160 (1974); *Westlake Farms, Inc. v. County of Kings*, 39 Cal. App. 3d 179, 114 Cal. Rptr. 137 (1974).

Subdivision (b)(3) provides that this title does not apply to an action brought under the California Tort Claims Act. However, subdivision (b)(3) does not prevent the claims requirements of the Tort Claims Act from applying to an action seeking primarily money damages and also extraordinary relief incidental to the prayer for damages. See Section 1123.730(b) (damages subject to Tort Claims Act “if applicable”); *Eureka Teacher’s Ass’n v. Board of Educ.*, 202 Cal. App. 3d 469, 474-76, 247 Cal. Rptr. 790 (1988); *Loehr v. Ventura County Community College Dist.*, 147 Cal. App. 3d 1071, 1081, 195 Cal. Rptr. 576 (1983). However, this title does apply to compel an agency to pay a claim that has been allowed and is required to be paid. Gov’t Code § 942.

Under subdivision (c), this title does not apply, for example, to enforcement of a government bond in an action at law, or to actions involving contract, intellectual property, or copyright. This title does apply to denial by the Department of Health Services of a claim by a health care provider where the department has statutory authority to determine such claims. See, e.g., Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 14103.6, 14103.7. Judicial review of denial of such a claim is under this title and not, for example, in small claims court. See Section 1121.120 (this title provides exclusive procedure for judicial review of agency action).

Subdivision (e) recognizes that another statute may apply this title to a nongovernmental entity. See Health & Safety Code § 1339.63 (adjudication by private hospital board).

References in section Comments in this title to the “1981 Model State APA” mean the Model State Administrative Procedure Act (1981) promulgated by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. See 15 U.L.A. 1 (1990).

#### **§ 1121.110. Conflicting or inconsistent statute controls**

1121.110. A statute applicable to a particular entity or a particular agency action prevails over a conflicting or inconsistent provision of this title.

**Comment.** Section 1121.110 is drawn from the first sentence of former Government Code Section 11523 (judicial review in accordance with provisions of Code of Civil Procedure “subject, however, to the statutes relating to the particular agency”). As used in Section 1121.110, “statute” does not include a local ordinance. See Cal. Const. art. IV, § 8(b) (statute enacted only by bill in the Legislature); *id.* art. XI, § 7 (local ordinance).

1   **§ 1121.120. Other forms of judicial review replaced**

2       1121.120. (a) The procedure provided in this title for judicial review of agency  
3       action is a proceeding for extraordinary relief in the nature of mandamus and shall  
4       be used in place of administrative mandamus, ordinary mandamus, certiorari,  
5       prohibition, declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and any other judicial procedure,  
6       to the extent those procedures might otherwise be used for judicial review of  
7       agency action.

8       (b) Nothing in this title limits use of the writ of habeas corpus.

9       (c) Notwithstanding Section 427.10, no cause of action may be joined in a  
10      proceeding under this title unless it states independent grounds for relief.

11      **Comment.** Subdivision (a) of Section 1121.120 is drawn from 1981 Model State APA  
12      Section 5-101. By establishing this title as the exclusive method for judicial review of agency  
13      action, Section 1121.120 continues and broadens the effect of former Section 1094.5. See,  
14      e.g., *Viso v. State*, 92 Cal. App. 3d 15, 21, 154 Cal. Rptr. 580, 584 (1979). Subdivision (a)  
15      implements the original writ jurisdiction given by Article VI, Section 10, of the California  
16      Constitution (original jurisdiction for extraordinary relief in the nature of mandamus).  
17      Nothing in this title limits the original writ jurisdiction of the courts. *Cf.* Section 1123.510(b).

18      Under subdivision (b), this title does not apply to the writ of habeas corpus. See Cal. Const.  
19      art. I, § 11, art. VI, § 10. See also *In re McVickers*, 29 Cal. 2d 264, 176 P.2d 40 (1946); *In re*  
20      *Stewart*, 24 Cal. 2d 344, 149 P.2d 689 (1944); *In re DeMond*, 165 Cal. App. 3d 932, 211 Cal.  
21      Rptr. 680 (1985).

22      Subdivision (c) continues prior law. See, e.g., *State v. Superior Court*, 12 Cal. 3d 237, 249-  
23      51, 524 P.2d 1281, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 504 (1974) (declaratory relief not appropriate to  
24      review administrative decision, but is appropriate to declare a statute facially unconstitutional);  
25      *Hensler v. City of Glendale*, 8 Cal. 4th 1, 876 P.2d 1043, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 244, 253 (1994)  
26      (inverse condemnation action may be joined in administrative mandamus proceeding  
27      involving same facts); *Mata v. City of Los Angeles*, 20 Cal. App. 4th 141, 147-48, 24 Cal.  
28      Rptr. 2d 314, 318 (1993) (complaint for violation of civil rights may be joined with  
29      administrative mandamus). If other causes of action are joined with a proceeding for judicial  
30      review, the court may sever the causes for trial. See Section 1048. See also Section 598.

31      Nothing in this section limits the type of relief or remedial action available in a proceeding  
32      under this title. See Section 1123.730 (type of relief).

33   **§ 1121.130. Injunctive relief ancillary**

34       1121.130. Injunctive relief is ancillary to and may be used as a supplemental  
35       remedy in connection with a proceeding under this title.

36      **Comment.** Section 1121.130 makes clear that the procedures for injunctive relief may be  
37      used in a proceeding under this title. See Section 1123.730 (injunctive relief authorized).

38   **§ 1121.140. Exercise of agency discretion**

39       1121.140. Nothing in this title authorizes the court to interfere with a valid  
40       exercise of agency discretion or to direct an agency how to exercise its  
41       discretion.

42      **Comment.** Section 1121.140 is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 1-116(c)(8)(i),  
43      and is consistent with the last clause in former Section 1094.5(f).

### **§ 1121.150. Application of new law**

1121.150. (a) This title applies to a proceeding commenced on or after January 1, 1998, for judicial review of agency action.

(b) The applicable law in effect before January 1, 1998, continues to apply to a proceeding for judicial review of agency action pending on January 1, 1988.

**Comment.** Subdivision (a) of Section 1121.150 applies this title to a proceeding commenced on or after the operative date.

Subdivision (b) is drawn from a portion of 1981 Model State APA Section 1-108. Pending proceedings for administrative mandamus, declaratory relief, and other proceedings for judicial review of agency action are not governed by this title, but should be completed under the applicable provisions other than this title.

## Article 2. Definitions

### § 1121.210. Application of definitions

1121.210. Unless the provision or context requires otherwise, the definitions in this article govern the construction of this title.

**Comment.** Section 1121.210 limits these definitions to judicial review of agency action. Some parallel provisions may be found in the statutes governing adjudicative proceedings by state agencies. See Gov't Code §§ 11405.10-11405.80 (operative July 1, 1997).

**§ 1121.220. Adjudicative proceeding**

1121.220. “Adjudicative proceeding” means an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts pursuant to which an agency formulates and issues a decision.

**Comment.** Section 1121.220 is drawn from the Administrative Procedure Act. See Gov't Code § 11405.20 (operative July 1, 1997) & Comment (“adjudicative proceeding” defined). See also Sections 1121.230 (“agency” defined), 1121.250 (“decision” defined).

**§ 1121.230. Agency**

1121.230. (a) “Agency” means a board, bureau, commission, department, division, governmental subdivision or unit of a governmental subdivision, office, officer, or other administrative unit, including the agency head, and one or more members of the agency head or agency employees or other persons directly or indirectly purporting to act on behalf of or under the authority of the agency head.

(b) When this title applies to judicial review of decision of a nongovernmental entity, “agency” includes such an entity.

**Comment.** Section 1121.230 is drawn from the Administrative Procedure Act. See Gov’t Code § 11405.30 (operative July 1, 1997) & Comment (“agency” defined). Subdivision (a) is broadly drawn to subject all governmental units to this title unless expressly excepted by Section 1120.

### § 1121.240. Agency action

1121.240. “Agency action” means any of the following:

(a) The whole or a part of a rule or a decision.

(b) The failure to issue a rule or a decision.

(c) An agency's performance of, or failure to perform, any other duty, function, or activity, discretionary or otherwise.

**Comment.** Section 1121.240 is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 1-102(2). The term "agency action" includes a "rule" and a "decision" defined in Sections 1121.290 (rule) and 1121.250 (decision), and an agency's failure to issue a rule or decision. It goes further, however. Subdivision (c) makes clear that "agency action" includes everything and anything else that an agency does or does not do, whether its action or inaction is discretionary or otherwise. There are no exclusions from that all-encompassing definition. As a consequence, there is a category of "agency action" that is neither a "decision" nor a "rule" because it neither establishes the legal rights of any particular person nor establishes law or policy of general applicability.

The principal effect of the broad definition of "agency action" is that everything an agency does or does not do is subject to judicial review if the limitations provided in Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 1123.110) are satisfied. See Section 1123.110 (requirements for judicial review). Success on the merits in such cases, however, is another thing. See also Sections 1121.230 ("agency" defined), 1123.160 (condition of relief).

#### § 1121.250. Decision

1121.250. "Decision" means an agency action of specific application that determines a legal right, duty, privilege, immunity, or other legal interest of a particular person.

**Comment.** Section 1121.250 is drawn from the Administrative Procedure Act. See Gov't Code § 11405.50 (operative July 1, 1997) & Comment ("decision" defined). See also Sections 1121.240 ("agency action" defined), 1121.280 ("person" defined).

#### § 1121.260. Local agency

1121.260. "Local agency" means "local agency" as defined in Section 54951 of the Government Code.

**Comment.** Section 1121.260 is drawn from former Section 1094.6, and is broadened to include school districts. See also Section 1121.230 ("agency" defined).

#### § 1121.270. Party

1121.270. (a) As it relates to agency proceedings, "party" means the agency that is taking action, the person to which the agency action is directed, and any other person named as a party or allowed to appear or intervene in the agency proceedings.

(b) As it relates to judicial review proceedings, "party" means the person seeking judicial review of agency action and any other person named as a party or allowed to participate as a party in the judicial review proceedings.

**Comment.** Subdivision (a) of Section 1121.270 is drawn from the Administrative Procedure Act. See Gov't Code § 11405.60 (operative July 1, 1997) & Comment ("decision" defined). This section does not address the question of whether a person is entitled to judicial review. Standing to obtain judicial review is dealt with in Article 2 (commencing with Section 1123.210) of Chapter 3. See also Section 1121.230 ("agency" defined).

1   **§ 1121.280. Person**

2       1121.280. “Person” includes an individual, partnership, corporation,  
3 governmental subdivision or unit of a governmental subdivision, or public or  
4 private organization or entity of any character.

5       **Comment.** Section 1121.280 is drawn from the Administrative Procedure Act. See Gov’t  
6 Code § 11405.70 (operative July 1, 1997) & Comment (“person” defined). It supplements  
7 the definition in Code of Civil Procedure Section 17 and is broader in its application to a  
8 governmental subdivision or unit. This includes an agency other than the agency against  
9 which rights under this title are asserted by the person. Inclusion of such agencies and units  
10 of government insures, therefore, that other agencies or other governmental bodies will be  
11 accorded all the rights that a person has under this title.

12   **§ 1121.290. Rule**

13       1121.290. “Rule” means both of the following:

14       (a) The whole or a part of an agency regulation (including a “regulation” as  
15 defined in Section 11342 of the Government Code), order, or standard of general  
16 applicability that implements, interprets, makes specific, or prescribes law or  
17 policy, or the organization, procedure, or practice requirements of an agency,  
18 except one that relates only to the internal management of the agency. The term  
19 includes the amendment, supplement, repeal, or suspension of an existing rule.

20       (b) A local agency ordinance.

21       **Comment.** Subdivision (a) is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 1-102(10) and  
22 Government Code Section 11342(g). The definition includes all agency orders of general  
23 applicability that implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy, without regard to the  
24 terminology used by the issuing agency to describe them. The exception in subdivision (a)  
25 for an agency standard that relates only to the internal management of the agency is drawn  
26 from Government Code Section 11342(g), and is generalized to apply to local agencies. See  
27 also Sections 1121.230 (“agency” defined), 1121.260 (“local agency” defined).

28       This title applies to an agency rule whether or not the rule is a “regulation” to which the  
29 rulemaking provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act apply.

30                   **CHAPTER 2. PRIMARY JURISDICTION**

31   **§ 1122.010. Application of chapter**

32       1122.010. Notwithstanding Section 1120, this chapter applies if a judicial  
33 proceeding is pending and the court determines that an agency has exclusive or  
34 concurrent jurisdiction over the subject matter of the proceeding or an issue in  
35 the proceeding.

36       **Comment.** Section 1122.010 makes clear that the provisions governing primary  
37 jurisdiction come into play only when there is exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction in an  
38 agency over a matter that is the subject of a pending judicial proceeding. The introductory  
39 clause makes clear this chapter applies, for example, to a judicial proceeding involving a trial  
40 de novo. The term “judicial proceeding” is used to mean any proceeding in court, including  
41 a civil action or a special proceeding.

42       This chapter deals with original jurisdiction over a matter, rather than with judicial review of  
43 previous agency action on the matter. If the matter has previously been the subject of agency  
44 action and is currently the subject of judicial review, the governing provisions relating to the

1 court's jurisdiction are found in Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 1123.110) (judicial  
2 review) rather than in this chapter.

3 **§ 1122.020. Exclusive agency jurisdiction**

4 1122.020. If an agency has exclusive jurisdiction over the subject matter of the  
5 proceeding or an issue in the proceeding, the court shall decline to exercise  
6 jurisdiction over the subject matter or the issue. The court may dismiss the  
7 proceeding or retain jurisdiction pending agency action on the matter or issue.

8 **Comment.** Section 1122.020 requires the court to yield primary jurisdiction to an agency  
9 if there is a legislative scheme to vest the determination in the agency. Adverse agency action  
10 is subject to judicial review. See Section 1122.040 (judicial review following agency action).

11 **§ 1122.030. Concurrent agency jurisdiction**

12 1122.030. (a) If an agency has concurrent jurisdiction over the subject matter of  
13 the proceeding or an issue in the proceeding, the court shall exercise jurisdiction  
14 over the subject matter or issue unless the court in its discretion refers the matter  
15 or issue for agency action. The court may exercise its discretion to refer the matter  
16 or issue for agency action only if the court determines the reference is clearly  
17 appropriate taking into consideration all relevant factors including, but not limited  
18 to, the following:

19 (1) Whether agency expertise is important for proper resolution of a highly  
20 technical matter or issue.

21 (2) Whether the area is so pervasively regulated by the agency that the  
22 regulatory scheme should not be subject to judicial interference.

23 (3) Whether there is a need for uniformity that would be jeopardized by the  
24 possibility of conflicting judicial decisions.

25 (4) Whether there is a need for immediate resolution of the matter, and any  
26 delay that would be caused by referral for agency action.

27 (5) The costs to the parties of additional administrative proceedings.

28 (6) Whether agency remedies are adequate and whether any delay for agency  
29 action would limit judicial remedies, either practically or due to running of statutes  
30 of limitation or otherwise.

31 (7) Any legislative intent to prefer cumulative remedies or to prefer  
32 administrative resolution.

33 (b) This section does not apply to a criminal proceeding.

34 (c) Nothing in this section confers concurrent jurisdiction on a court over the  
35 subject matter of a pending disciplinary proceeding under the Administrative  
36 Procedure Act, Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division  
37 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

38 **Comment.** Section 1122.030 codifies the court's broad discretion to refer the matter or an  
39 issue to an agency for action if there is concurrent jurisdiction. See, e.g., *Farmers Ins. Exch.*  
40 *v. Superior Court*, 2 Cal. 4th 377, 391-92, 826 P.2d 730, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 487, 496 (1992). See  
41 generally Asimow, *Judicial Review: Standing and Timing* 66-82 (Sept. 1992).

42 Court retention of jurisdiction does not preclude agency involvement. For example, the  
43 court in its discretion may request that the agency file an amicus brief setting forth its views

on the matter as an alternative to referring the matter to the agency. If the matter is referred to the agency, the agency action remains subject to judicial review. Section 1122.040 (judicial review following agency action).

#### **§ 1122.040. Judicial review following agency action**

1122.040. If an agency has exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction over the subject matter of the proceeding or an issue in the proceeding, agency action on the matter or issue is subject to judicial review to the extent provided in Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 1123.110).

**Comment.** Section 1122.040 makes clear that judicial review principles apply to agency action even though an agency has exclusive jurisdiction or the court refers a matter of concurrent jurisdiction to the agency for action under this chapter.

## **CHAPTER 3. JUDICIAL REVIEW**

### **Article 1. General Provisions**

#### **§ 1123.110. Requirements for judicial review**

1123.110. (a) Subject to subdivision (b), a person who has standing under this chapter and who satisfies the requirements governing exhaustion of administrative remedies, ripeness, time for filing, and other preconditions is entitled to judicial review of final agency action.

(b) The court may summarily decline to grant judicial review if the petition for review does not present a substantial issue for resolution by the court.

**Comment.** Subdivision (a) of Section 1123.110 is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-102(a). It ties together the threshold requirements for obtaining judicial review of final agency action, and guarantees the right to judicial review if these requirements are met. See, e.g., Sections 1123.120 (finality), 1123.130 (judicial review of agency rule), 1123.210 (standing), 1123.310 (exhaustion of administrative remedies), 1123.640-1123.650 (time for filing petition for review of decision in adjudicative proceeding).

The term “agency action” is defined in Section 1121.240. The term includes rules, decisions, and other types of agency action and inaction. This chapter contains provisions for judicial review of all types of agency action.

Subdivision (b) continues the former discretion of the courts to decline to grant a writ of administrative mandamus. *Parker v. Bowron*, 40 Cal. 2d 344, 351, 254 P.2d 6, 9 (1953); *Dare v. Board of Medical Examiners*, 21 Cal. 2d 790, 796, 136 P.2d 304, 308 (1943); *Berry v. Coronado Bd. of Education*, 238 Cal. App. 2d 391, 397, 47 Cal. Rptr. 727 (1965); *California Administrative Mandamus* § 1.3, at 5 (Cal. Cont. Ed. Bar, 2d ed. 1989). See also Section 1121.120 (judicial review as proceeding for extraordinary relief in the nature of mandamus).

#### **§ 1123.120. Finality**

1123.120. A person may not obtain judicial review of agency action unless the agency action is final.

**Comment.** Section 1123.120 continues the finality requirement of former Section 1094.5(a) in language drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-102(b)(2). Agency action is typically not final if the agency intends the action to be preliminary, preparatory, procedural, or intermediate with regard to subsequent action of that agency or another agency. For example, state agency action concerning a proposed rule subject to the

rulemaking part of the Administrative Procedure Act is not final until the agency submits the proposed rule to the Office of Administrative Law for review as provided by that act, and the Office of Administrative Law approves the rule pursuant to Government Code Section 11349.3. See also Section 1123.130(a) (rulemaking may not be enjoined or prohibited).

For an exception to the requirement of finality, see Section 1123.140 (exception to finality and ripeness requirements).

#### **§ 1123.130. Judicial review of agency rule**

1123.130. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a court may not enjoin or otherwise prohibit an agency from adopting a rule.

(b) A person may not obtain judicial review of an agency rule until the rule has been applied by the agency.

**Comment.** Subdivision (a) of Section 1123.130 continues State Water Resources Control Bd. v. Office of Admin. Law, 12 Cal. App. 4th 697, 707-08, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 25, 31-32 (1993). Subdivision (a) prohibits, for example, a court from enjoining a state agency from holding a public hearing or otherwise proceeding to adopt a proposed rule on the ground that the notice was legally defective. Similarly, subdivision (a) prohibits a court from enjoining the Office of Administrative Law from reviewing or approving a proposed rule that has been submitted by a regulatory agency pursuant to Government Code Section 11343(a). A rule is subject to judicial review after it is adopted. See Sections 1120, 1123.110. See also Section 1123.140 (rule must be fit for immediate judicial review).

Subdivision (b) codifies the case law ripeness requirement for judicial review of an agency rule. See, e.g., Pacific Legal Foundation v. California Coastal Comm'n, 33 Cal. 3d 158, 655 P.2d 306, 188 Cal. Rptr. 104 (1982). See also Section 1121.290 ("rule" defined). For an exception to the requirement of ripeness, see Section 1123.140. An allegation that procedures followed in adopting a state agency rule were legally deficient would not be ripe for judicial review until the agency completes the rulemaking process and formally adopts the rule (typically by submitting it to the Office of Administrative Law pursuant to Government Code Section 11343), the Office of Administrative Law approves the rule and submits it to the Secretary of State pursuant to Government Code Section 11349.3 thus allowing it to become final, and the adopting agency applies the rule.

#### **§ 1123.140. Exception to finality and ripeness requirements**

1123.140. A person may obtain judicial review of agency action that is not final or, in the case of an agency rule, that has not been applied by the agency, if all of the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) It appears likely that the person will be able to obtain judicial review of the agency action when it becomes final or, in the case of an agency rule, when it has been applied by the agency.

(b) The issue is fit for immediate judicial review.

(c) Postponement of judicial review would result in an inadequate remedy or irreparable harm disproportionate to the public benefit derived from postponement.

**Comment.** Section 1123.140 codifies an exception to the finality and ripeness requirements in language drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-103. An issue is fit for immediate judicial review if it is primarily legal rather than factual in nature and can be adequately reviewed in the absence of concrete application by the agency. Under this language the court must assess and balance the fitness of the issues for immediate judicial review against hardship to the person from deferring review. See, e.g., BKHN, Inc. v.

1 Department of Health Services, 3 Cal. App. 4th 301, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 188 (1992); Abbott  
2 Laboratories v. Gardner, 387 U.S. 136 (1967).

3 **§ 1123.150. Proceeding not moot because penalty completed**

4 1123.150. A proceeding under this chapter is not made moot by satisfaction of a  
5 penalty imposed by agency action during the pendency of the proceeding.

6 **Comment.** Section 1123.150 continues the substance of the seventh sentence of former  
7 Section 1094.5(g) and the fourth sentence of former Section 1094.5(h)(3).

8 **§ 1123.160. Condition of relief**

9 1123.160. The court may grant relief under this chapter only if it determines that  
10 agency action is invalid on grounds specified in Article 4 (commencing with  
11 Section 1123.410) for reviewing agency action.

12 **Comment.** Section 1123.160 is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-116(c)  
13 (introductory clause). It supersedes the provision in former Section 1094.5(b) that the  
14 inquiry in an administrative mandamus case is whether the agency proceeded without or in  
15 excess of jurisdiction, whether there was a fair trial, and whether there was any prejudicial  
16 abuse of discretion. The grounds for invalidating agency action under Article 4 are the  
17 following (see Sections 1123.420-1123.460):

18 (1) Whether the agency action, or the statute or regulation on which the agency action is  
19 based, is unconstitutional on its face or as applied.

20 (2) Whether the agency acted beyond the jurisdiction conferred by the constitution, a  
21 statute, or a regulation.

22 (3) Whether the agency has decided all issues requiring resolution.

23 (4) Whether the agency has erroneously interpreted the law.

24 (5) Whether the agency has erroneously applied the law to the facts.

25 (6) Whether agency action is based on an erroneous determination of fact made or implied  
26 by the agency.

27 (7) Whether agency action is a proper exercise of discretion.

28 (8) Whether the agency has engaged in an unlawful procedure or decision making process,  
29 or has failed to follow prescribed procedure.

30 (9) Whether the persons taking the agency action were improperly constituted as a decision  
31 making body or subject to disqualification.

32 **Article 2. Standing**

33 **§ 1123.210. No standing unless authorized by statute**

34 1123.210. A person does not have standing to obtain judicial review of agency  
35 action unless standing is conferred by this article or is otherwise expressly  
36 provided by statute.

37 **Comment.** Section 1123.210 states the intent of this article to override existing case law  
38 standing principles and to replace them with the statutory standards prescribed in this article.  
39 Other statutes conferring standing include Public Resources Code Section 30801 (judicial  
40 review of decision of Coastal Commission by “any aggrieved person”).

41 This title provides a single judicial review procedure for all types of agency action. See  
42 Section 1121.120. The provisions on standing therefore accommodate persons who seek  
43 judicial review of the entire range of agency actions, including rules, decisions, and other  
44 action or inaction. See Section 1121.240 (“agency action” defined).

1   **§ 1123.220. Private interest standing**

2       1123.220. (a) An interested person has standing to obtain judicial review of  
3       agency action.

4       (b) An organization that does not otherwise have standing under subdivision  
5       (a) has standing if an interested person is a member of the organization, or a  
6       nonmember the organization is required to represent, and the agency action is  
7       germane to the purposes of the organization.

8       **Comment.** Section 1123.220 governs private interest standing for judicial review of agency  
9       action other than adjudication. For special rules governing standing for judicial review of a  
10      decision in an adjudicative proceeding, see Section 1123.240. *Cf.* Section 1121.240  
11      (“agency action” defined).

12      The provision of subdivision (a) that an “interested” person has standing is drawn from  
13      the law governing writs of mandate, and from the law governing judicial review of state  
14      agency regulations. See, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060 (interested person may obtain  
15      declaratory relief), 1069 (party beneficially interested may obtain writ of review), 1086 (party  
16      beneficially interested may obtain writ of mandate); Gov’t Code § 11350(a) (interested  
17      person may obtain judicial declaration on validity of state agency regulation); *cf.* Code Civ.  
18      Proc. § 902 (appeal by party aggrieved). This requirement continues case law that a person  
19      must suffer some harm from the agency action in order to have standing to obtain judicial  
20      review of the action on a basis of private, as opposed to public, interest. See, e.g., *Sperry &*  
21      *Hutchinson Co. v. California State Bd. of Pharmacy*, 241 Cal. App. 2d 229, 50 Cal. Rptr. 489  
22      (1966); *Silva v. City of Cypress*, 204 Cal. App. 2d 374, 22 Cal. Rptr. 453 (1962). A  
23      plaintiff’s private interest is sufficient to confer standing if that interest is over and above that  
24      of members of the general public. *Carsten v. Psychology Examining Committee*, 27 Cal. 3d  
25      793, 796, 614 P.2d 276, 166 Cal. Rptr. 844 (1980). Non-pecuniary injuries, such as  
26      environmental or aesthetic claims, are sufficient to satisfy the private interest test. *Bozung v.*  
27      *Local Agency Formation Comm’n*, 13 Cal. 3d 263, 529 P.2d 1017, 118 Cal. Rptr. 249  
28      (1975); *Albion River Watershed Protection Ass’n v. Department of Forestry*, 235 Cal. App.  
29      3d 358, 286 Cal. Rptr. 573 (1991); *Kane v. Redevelopment Agency of Hidden Hills*, 179 Cal.  
30      App. 3d 899, 224 Cal. Rptr. 922 (1986); *Citizens Ass’n for Sensible Development v. County*  
31      *of Inyo*, 172 Cal. App. 3d 151, 217 Cal. Rptr. 893 (1985). See generally Asimow, *Judicial*  
32      *Review: Standing and Timing* 6-8 (Sept. 1992).

33      Subdivision (a) merely requires a person be “interested” to seek judicial review. Thus if a  
34      person has sufficient interest in the subject matter, the person may seek judicial review even  
35      though the person did not personally participate in the agency proceeding. See *Friends of*  
36      *Mammoth v. Board of Supervisors*, 8 Cal. 3d 247, 267-68, 502 P.2d 1049, 104 Cal. Rptr. 761  
37      (1972). However, in most cases the exhaustion of remedies rule requires the issue to be  
38      reviewed to have been raised before the agency by someone. See Section 1123.350.

39      Subdivision (b) codifies case law giving an incorporated or unincorporated association,  
40      such as a trade union or neighborhood association, standing to obtain judicial review on  
41      behalf of its members. See, e.g., *Professional Fire Fighters, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 60  
42      Cal. 2d 276, 384 P. 2d 158, 32 Cal. Rptr. 830 (1963); *Residents of Beverly Glen, Inc. v. City*  
43      *of Los Angeles*, 34 Cal. App. 3d 117, 109 Cal. Rptr. 724 (1973). This principle extends to  
44      standing of the organization to obtain judicial review where a nonmember is adversely  
45      affected, as where a trade union is required to represent the interests of nonmembers. For an  
46      organization to have standing under this subdivision, there must be an adverse effect on an  
47      actual member or other represented person. Discovery would be appropriate to ascertain this  
48      fact.

49      Standing of a person to obtain judicial review under this section is not limited to private  
50      persons, but extends to public entities as well, whether state or local. See Section 1121.280  
51      (“person” includes governmental subdivision). See also Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090  
52      (Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control may get judicial review of decision of Alcoholic

Beverage Control Appeals Board); *Martin v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Bd.*, 52 Cal. 2d 238, 243, 340 P.2d 1, 4 (1959) (same); Veh. Code § 3058 (DMV may get judicial review of order of New Motor Vehicle Board); *Tieberg v. Superior Court*, 243 Cal. App. 2d 277, 283, 52 Cal. Rptr. 33, 37 (1966) (Director of Department of Employment may get judicial review of decision of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board, a division of that department); *Los Angeles County Dep't of Health Serv. v. Kennedy*, 163 Cal. App. 3d 799, 209 Cal. Rptr. 595 (1984) (county department of health services may get judicial review of decision of county civil service commission); *County of Los Angeles v. Tax Appeals Bd. No. 2*, 267 Cal. App. 2d 830, 834, 73 Cal. Rptr. 469, 471 (1968) (county may get judicial review of tax appeals board decision); *County of Contra Costa v. Social Welfare Bd.*, 199 Cal. App. 2d 468, 471, 18 Cal. Rptr. 573, 575 (1962) (county may get judicial review of State Social Welfare Board decision ordering county to reinstate welfare benefits); *Board of Permit Appeals v. Central Permit Bureau*, 186 Cal. App. 2d 633, 9 Cal. Rptr. 83 (1960) (local permit appeals board may get traditional mandamus against inferior agency that did not comply with its decision). *But cf.* *Star-Kist Foods, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles*, 42 Cal. 3d 1, 719 P.2d 987, 227 Cal. Rptr. 391 (1986) (city or county standing to challenge state action as violating federal constitutional rights).

#### § 1123.230. Public interest standing

1123.230. Whether or not a person has standing under Section 1123.220, a person has standing to obtain judicial review of agency action that concerns an important right affecting the public interest if all of the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) The person resides or conducts business in the jurisdiction of the agency or is an organization that has a member that resides or conducts business in the jurisdiction of the agency and the agency action is germane to the purposes of the organization.

(b) The person will adequately protect the public interest.

(c) The person has previously requested the agency to correct the agency action and the agency has not, within a reasonable time, done so. The request shall be in writing unless made orally on the record in the agency proceeding. The agency may by rule require the request to be directed to the proper agency official. As used in this subdivision, a reasonable time shall not be less than 30 days unless the request shows that a shorter period is required to avoid irreparable harm. This subdivision does not apply to judicial review of an agency rule.

**Comment.** Section 1123.230 governs public interest standing for judicial review of agency action other than adjudication. For special rules governing standing for judicial review of a decision in an adjudicative proceeding, see Section 1123.240. See also Section 1121.240 ("agency action" defined).

Section 1123.230 codifies California case law that a member of the public may obtain judicial review of agency action (or inaction) to implement the public right to enforce a public duty. See, e.g., *Green v. Obledo*, 29 Cal. 3d 126, 144-45, 624 P.2d 256, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206 (1981); *Hollman v. Warren*, 32 Cal. 2d 351, 196 P.2d 562 (1948); *Board of Social Welfare v. County of Los Angeles*, 27 Cal. 2d 98, 162 P.2d 627 (1945); *California Homeless & Housing Coalition v. Anderson*, 31 Cal. App. 4th 450, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 639 (1995); *Environmental Law Fund, Inc. v. Town of Corte Madera*, 49 Cal. App. 3d 105, 122 Cal. Rptr. 282 (1975); *American Friends Service Committee v. Procunier*, 33 Cal. App. 3d 252, 109 Cal. Rptr. 22 (1973).

1 Section 1123.230 supersedes the standing rules of Section 526a (taxpayer actions). Under  
2 Section 1123.230 a person, whether or not a taxpayer within the jurisdiction, has standing to  
3 obtain judicial review, including restraining and preventing illegal expenditure or injury by a  
4 public entity, if the general public interest requirements of this section are satisfied.

5 Section 1123.230 applies to all types of relief sought, whether pecuniary or nonpecuniary,  
6 injunctive or declaratory, or otherwise. The test for standing under this section is whether  
7 there is a duty owed to the general public or a large class of persons. A person may have  
8 standing under the section to have the law enforced in the public interest, regardless of any  
9 private interest or personal adverse effect.

10 The limitations in subdivisions (a)-(c) are drawn loosely from other provisions of state and  
11 federal law. See, e.g., Section 1021.5 (attorney fees in public interest litigation); Section  
12 1123.220 & Comment (private interest standing); first portion of Section 526a (taxpayer  
13 within jurisdiction); Corp. Code § 800(b)(2) (allegation in shareholder derivative action of  
14 efforts to secure action from board); Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 23(a) (representative must fairly and  
15 adequately protect interests of class). The requirement in subdivision (c) of a request to the  
16 agency does not supersede the California Environmental Quality Act. See Section 1121.110  
17 (conflicting or inconsistent statute controls); Pub. Res. Code § 21177 (objection may be oral  
18 or written).

#### 19 **§ 1123.240. Standing for review of decision in adjudicative proceeding**

20 1123.240. Notwithstanding any other provision of this article, a person does  
21 not have standing to obtain judicial review of a decision in an adjudicative  
22 proceeding unless one of the following conditions is satisfied:

23 (a) The person is a party to a proceeding under Chapter 4.5 (commencing with  
24 Section 11400) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

25 (b) The person is a participant in a proceeding other than a proceeding  
26 described in subdivision (a) and satisfies Section 1123.220 or 1123.230.

27 **Comment.** Section 1123.240 provides special rules for standing to obtain judicial review of  
28 a decision in an adjudicative proceeding. Standing to obtain judicial review of other agency  
29 actions is governed by Sections 1123.220 (private interest standing) and 1123.230 (public  
30 interest standing). Special statutes governing standing requirements for judicial review of an  
31 agency decision prevail over this section. Section 1123.210 (standing expressly provided by  
32 statute); see, e.g., Pub. Res. Code § 30801 (judicial review of decision of Coastal Commission  
33 by “any aggrieved person”).

34 Subdivision (a) governs standing to challenge a decision in an adjudicative proceeding  
35 under the Administrative Procedure Act. The provision is thus limited primarily to a state  
36 agency adjudication where an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts is statutorily or  
37 constitutionally required for formulation and issuance of a decision. See Gov’t Code §§  
38 11410.10-11410.50 (application of administrative adjudication provisions of Administrative  
39 Procedure Act) (operative July 1, 1997).

40 A party to an adjudicative proceeding under the Administrative Procedure Act includes the  
41 person to whom the agency action is directed and any other person named as a party or  
42 allowed to intervene in the proceeding. Section 1121.270 (“party” defined). This codifies  
43 existing law. See, e.g., *Temescal Water Co. v. Department of Public Works*, 44 Cal. 2d 90, 279  
44 P. 2d 1 (1955); *Covert v. State Bd. of Equalization*, 29 Cal. 2d 125, 173 P. 2d 545 (1946).  
45 Under this test, a complainant or victim who is not made a party does not have standing. A  
46 nonparty who might otherwise have private or public interest standing under Section  
47 1123.220 or 1123.230 would not have standing to obtain judicial review of a decision under  
48 the Administrative Procedure Act.

49 Subdivision (b) applies to a decision in an adjudicative proceeding other than a proceeding  
50 subject to the Administrative Procedure Act. Under this provision, a person does not have

standing to obtain judicial review unless the person both (1) was a participant in the proceeding and (2) satisfies the requirements of either Section 1123.220 (private interest standing) or Section 1123.230 (public interest standing). Participation may include appearing and testifying, submitting written comments, or other appropriate activity that indicates a direct involvement in the agency action.

### Article 3. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

#### § 1123.310. Exhaustion required

1123.310. A person may obtain judicial review of agency action only after exhausting all administrative remedies available within the agency whose action is to be reviewed and within any other agency authorized to exercise administrative review, unless judicial review before that time is permitted by this article or otherwise expressly provided by statute.

**Comment.** Section 1123.310 codifies the exhaustion of remedies doctrine of existing law. See, e.g., *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal*, 17 Cal. 2d 280, 109 P. 2d 942 (1941) (exhaustion requirement jurisdictional). Exceptions to the exhaustion requirement are stated in other provisions of this article. See Sections 1123.340 (exceptions to exhaustion of administrative remedies), 1123.350 (exact issue rule).

This chapter does not provide an exception from the exhaustion requirement for judicial review of an administrative law judge's denial of a continuance. *Cf.* former subdivision (c) of Gov't Code § 11524. Nor does it provide an exception for discovery decisions. *Cf.* *Shively v. Stewart*, 65 Cal. 2d 475, 421 P.2d 65, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217 (1966). This chapter does not continue the exemption found in the cases for a local tax assessment alleged to be a nullity. *Cf.* *Stenocord Corp. v. City and County of San Francisco*, 2 Cal. 3d 984, 471 P.2d 966, 88 Cal. Rptr. 166 (1970). Judicial review of such matters should not occur until conclusion of administrative proceedings.

This chapter does not require a person seeking judicial review of a rule to have participated in the rulemaking proceeding on which the rule is based. Section 1123.330. However, this chapter does prohibit judicial review of proposed regulations (see Section 1123.130), regulations that have been preliminarily adopted but are not yet final (Section 1123.120), and adopted regulations that have not yet been applied (Section 1123.130).

#### § 1123.320. Administrative review of adjudicative proceeding

1123.320. If the agency action being challenged is a decision in an adjudicative proceeding, all administrative remedies available within an agency are deemed exhausted for the purpose of Section 1123.310 if no higher level of review is available within the agency, whether or not a rehearing or other lower level of review is available within the agency, unless a statute or regulation requires a petition for rehearing or other administrative review.

**Comment.** Section 1123.320 restates the existing California rule that a petition for a rehearing or other lower level administrative review is not a prerequisite to judicial review of a decision in an adjudicative proceeding. See provisions of former Gov't Code § 11523; Gov't Code § 19588 (State Personnel Board). This overrules any contrary case law implication. *Cf.* *Alexander v. State Personnel Bd.*, 22 Cal. 2d 198, 137 P. 2d 433 (1943).

Administrative remedies are deemed exhausted under this section only when no further higher level review is available within the agency issuing the decision. This does not excuse any requirement of further administrative review by another agency such as an appeals board.

1   **§ 1123.330. Judicial review of rulemaking**

2   1123.330. (a) A person may obtain judicial review of rulemaking  
3 notwithstanding the person's failure to do either of the following:

4     (1) Participate in the rulemaking proceeding on which the rule is based.

5     (2) Petition the agency promulgating the rule for, or otherwise to seek,  
6 amendment, repeal, or reconsideration of the rule after it has become final.

7     (b) A person may obtain judicial review of an agency's failure to adopt a rule  
8 under Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of  
9 Title 2 of the Government Code, notwithstanding the person's failure to request  
10 or obtain a determination from the Office of Administrative Law under Section  
11 11340.5 of the Government Code.

12   **Comment.** Subdivision (a)(2) of Section 1123.330 continues the former second sentence  
13 of subdivision (a) of Government Code Section 11350, and generalizes it to apply to local  
14 agencies as well as state agencies. See Sections 1120 (application of title), 1121.230  
15 ("agency" defined), 1121.290 ("rule" defined). The petition to the agency referred to in  
16 subdivision (a) is authorized by Government Code Section 11340.6.

17   Subdivision (b) is new, and makes clear that exhaustion of remedies does not require filing  
18 a complaint with the Office of Administrative Law that an agency rule is an underground  
19 regulation. Cf. Gov't Code § 11340.5.

20   **§ 1123.340. Exceptions to exhaustion of administrative remedies**

21   1123.340. The requirement of exhaustion of administrative remedies is  
22 jurisdictional and the court may not relieve a person of the requirement unless  
23 any of the following conditions is satisfied:

24     (a) The remedies would be inadequate.

25     (b) The requirement would be futile.

26     (c) The requirement would result in irreparable harm disproportionate to the  
27 public and private benefit derived from exhaustion.

28     (d) The person was entitled to notice of a proceeding in which relief could be  
29 provided but lacked timely notice of the proceeding. The court's authority under  
30 this subdivision is limited to remanding the case to the agency to conduct a  
31 supplemental proceeding in which the person has an opportunity to participate.

32     (e) The person seeks judicial review on the ground that the agency lacks  
33 subject matter jurisdiction in the proceeding.

34     (f) The person seeks judicial review on the ground that a statute, regulation, or  
35 procedure is facially unconstitutional.

36   **Comment.** Section 1123.340 authorizes the reviewing court to relieve the person seeking  
37 judicial review of the exhaustion requirement in limited circumstances. This enables the court  
38 to exercise some discretion. See generally Asimow, *Judicial Review: Standing and Timing*  
39 39-52 (Sept. 1992). This section may not be used as a means to avoid compliance with other  
40 requirements for judicial review, however, such as the exact issue rule. See Section 1123.350.

41   The exceptions to the exhaustion of remedies requirement consolidate and codify a  
42 number of existing case law exceptions, including:

43   *Inadequate remedies.* Under subdivision (a), administrative remedies need not be exhausted  
44 if the available administrative review procedure, or the relief available through administrative  
45 review, is insufficient. This codifies case law. See, e.g., *Common Cause v. Board of*

Supervisors, 49 Cal. 3d 432, 443, 777 P.2d 610, 261 Cal. Rptr. 574 (1989); Endler v. Schutzbank, 68 Cal. 2d 162, 168, 436 P.2d 297, 65 Cal. Rptr. 297 (1968); Rosenfield v. Malcolm, 65 Cal. 2d 559, 421 P.2d 697, 55 Cal. Rptr. 505 (1967).

*Futility.* The exhaustion requirement is excused under subdivision (b) if it is certain, not merely probable, that the agency would deny the requested relief. See Ogo Assocs. v. City of Torrance, 37 Cal. App. 3d 830, 112 Cal. Rptr. 761 (1974).

*Irreparable harm.* Subdivision (c) codifies the existing narrow case law exception to the exhaustion of remedies requirement where exhaustion would result in irreparable harm disproportionate to the benefit derived from requiring exhaustion. The standard is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-107(3), but expands the factors to be considered to include private as well as public benefit.

*Lack of notice.* Lack of sufficient or timely notice of the agency proceeding is an excuse under subdivision (d). See Environmental Law Fund v. Town of Corte Madera, 49 Cal. App. 3d 105, 113-14, 122 Cal. Rptr. 282, 286 (1975).

*Lack of subject matter jurisdiction.* Subdivision (e) recognizes an exception to the exhaustion requirement where the challenge is to the agency's subject matter jurisdiction in the proceeding. See, e.g., County of Contra Costa v. State of California, 177 Cal. App. 3d 62, 73, 222 Cal. Rptr. 750, 758 (1986).

*Constitutional issues.* Under subdivision (f) administrative remedies need not be exhausted for a challenge to a statute, regulation, or procedure as unconstitutional on its face. See, e.g., Horn v. County of Ventura, 24 Cal. 3d 605, 611, 596 P.2d 1134, 156 Cal. Rptr. 718 (1979); Chevrolet Motor Div. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd., 146 Cal. App. 3d 533, 539, 194 Cal. Rptr. 270 (1983). There is no exception for a challenge to a provision as applied, even though phrased in constitutional terms.

#### **§ 1123.350. Exact issue rule**

1123.350. (a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), a person may not obtain judicial review of an issue that was not raised before the agency either by the person seeking judicial review or by another person.

(b) The court may permit judicial review of an issue that was not raised before the agency if any of the following conditions is satisfied:

(1) The agency did not have jurisdiction to grant an adequate remedy based on a determination of the issue.

(2) The person did not know and was under no duty to discover, or was under a duty to discover but could not reasonably have discovered, facts giving rise to the issue.

(3) The agency action subject to judicial review is a rule and the person has not been a party in an adjudicative proceeding that provided an adequate opportunity to raise the issue.

(4) The agency action subject to judicial review is a decision in an adjudicative proceeding and the person was not adequately notified of the adjudicative proceeding. If a statute or rule requires the person to maintain an address with the agency, adequate notice includes notice given to the person at the address maintained with the agency.

(5) The interests of justice would be served by judicial resolution of an issue arising from a change in controlling law occurring after the agency action or from agency action occurring after the person exhausted the last feasible opportunity to seek relief from the agency.

**Comment.** Subdivision (a) of Section 1123.350 codifies the case law exact issue rule. See, e.g., *Resource Defense Fund v. Local Agency Formation Comm'n*, 191 Cal. App. 3d 886, 894, 236 Cal. Rptr. 794, 798 (1987); *Coalition for Student Action v. City of Fullerton*, 153 Cal. App. 3d 1194, 200 Cal. Rptr. 855 (1984); see generally Asimow, *Judicial Review: Standing and Timing* 37-39 (Sept. 1992). It limits the issues that may be raised and considered in the reviewing court to those that were raised before the agency. The exact issue rule is in a sense a variation of the exhaustion of remedies requirement — the agency must first have had an opportunity to determine the issue that is subject to judicial review.

Under subdivision (b) the court may relieve a person of the exact issue requirement in circumstances that are in effect an elaboration of the doctrine of exhaustion of administrative remedies. See also Section 1123.340 & Comment (exceptions to exhaustion of administrative remedies).

The intent of paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) is to permit the court to consider an issue that was not raised before the agency if the agency did not have jurisdiction to grant an adequate remedy based on a determination of the issue. Examples include: (A) an issue as to the facial constitutionality of the statute that enables the agency to function to the extent state law prohibits the agency from passing on the validity of the statute; (B) an issue as to the amount of compensation due as a result of an agency's breach of contract to the extent state law prohibits the agency from passing on this type of question.

Paragraph (2) permits a party to raise a new issue in the reviewing court if the issue arises from newly discovered facts that the party excusably did not know at the time of the agency proceedings.

Paragraph (3) permits a party to raise a new issue in the reviewing court if the challenged agency action is an agency rule and if the person seeking to raise the new issue in court was not a party in an adjudicative proceeding which provided an opportunity to raise the issue before the agency.

Paragraph (4) permits a new issue to be raised in the reviewing court by a person who was not properly notified of the adjudicative proceeding which produced the challenged decision. This does not give standing to a person not otherwise entitled to notice of the adjudicative proceeding.

Paragraph (5) permits a new issue to be raised in the reviewing court if the interests of justice would be served thereby and the new issue arises from a change in controlling law, or from agency action after the person exhausted the last opportunity for seeking relief from the agency. See *Lindeleaf v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd.*, 41 Cal. 3d 861, 718 P.2d 106, 226 Cal. Rptr. 119 (1986).

## Article 4. Standards of Review

### § 1123.410. Standards of review of agency action

1123.410. Except as otherwise provided by statute, the validity of agency action shall be determined on judicial review under the standards of review provided in this article.

**Comment.** Section 1123.410 is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-116(a)(2). The scope of judicial review provided in this article may be qualified by another statute that establishes review based on different standards than those in this article. See, e.g., Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5170, 6931-6937.

### § 1123.420. Review of agency interpretation or application of law

1123.420. (a) The standard for judicial review of the following issues is the independent judgment of the court, giving deference to the determination of the agency appropriate to the circumstances of the agency action:

(1) Whether the agency action, or the statute or regulation on which the agency action is based, is unconstitutional on its face or as applied.

(2) Whether the agency acted beyond the jurisdiction conferred by the constitution, a statute, or a regulation.

(3) Whether the agency has decided all issues requiring resolution.

(4) Whether the agency has erroneously interpreted the law.

(5) Whether the agency has erroneously applied the law to the facts.

(b) This section does not apply to interpretation or application of law by the Public Employment Relations Board, Agricultural Labor Relations Board, or Workers' Compensation Appeals Board within the regulatory authority of those agencies.

**Comment.** Section 1123.420 clarifies and codifies existing case law on judicial review of agency interpretation of law.

Subdivision (a) applies the independent judgment test for judicial review of questions of law with appropriate deference to the agency's determination. Subdivision (a) codifies the case law rule that the final responsibility to decide legal questions belongs to the courts, not to administrative agencies. See, e.g., *Association of Psychology Providers v. Rank*, 51 Cal. 3d 1, 793 P.2d 2, 270 Cal. Rptr. 796 (1990). This rule is qualified by the requirement that the courts give deference to the agency's interpretation appropriate to the circumstances of the agency action. Factors in determining the deference appropriate include such matters as (1) whether the agency is interpreting a statute or its own regulation, (2) whether the agency's interpretation was contemporaneous with enactment of the law, (3) whether the agency has been consistent in its interpretation and the interpretation is long-standing, (4) whether there has been a reenactment with knowledge of the existing interpretation, (5) the degree to which the legal text is technical, obscure, or complex and the agency has interpretive qualifications superior to the court's, and (6) the degree to which the interpretation appears to have been carefully considered by responsible agency officials. See Asimow, *The Scope of Judicial Review of Decisions of California Administrative Agencies*, 42 UCLA L. Rev. 1157, 1195-98 (1995). See also *Jones v. Tracy School Dist.*, 27 Cal. 3d 99, 108, 611 P.2d 441, 165 Cal. Rptr. 100 (1980) (no deference for statutory interpretation in internal memo not subject to notice and hearing process for regulation and written after agency became amicus curiae in case at bench); *Hudgins v. Neiman Marcus Group, Inc.*, 34 Cal. App. 4th 1109, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 46 (1995) (deference to contemporaneous interpretation long acquiesced in by interested persons); *Grier v. Kizer*, 219 Cal. App. 3d 422, 434, 268 Cal. Rptr. 244 (1990) (deference to OAL interpretation of statute it enforces); *City of Los Angeles v. Los Olivos Mobile Home Park*, 213 Cal. App. 3d 1427, 262 Cal. Rptr. 446 (1989) (no deference for interpretation of city ordinance in internal memo not adopted as regulation); *Johnston v. Department of Personnel Administration*, 191 Cal. App. 3d 1218, 1226, 236 Cal. Rptr. 853 (1987) (no deference for interpretation in inter-departmental communication rather than in formal regulation); *California State Employees Ass'n v. State Personnel Bd.*, 178 Cal. App. 3d 372, 380, 223 Cal. Rptr. 826 (1986) (formal regulation entitled to deference, informal memo prepared for litigation not entitled to deference).

Under subdivision (a), the question of the appropriate degree of judicial deference to the agency interpretation or application of law is treated as "a continuum with nonreviewability at one end and independent judgment at the other." See *Western States Petroleum Ass'n v. Superior Court*, 9 Cal. 4th 559, 575-76, 888 P.2d 1268, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 139, 147-48 (1995). Subdivision (a) is consistent with and continues the substance of cases saying courts must accept statutory interpretation by an agency within its expertise unless "clearly erroneous" as that standard was applied in *Nipper v. California Auto. Assigned Risk Plan*, 19 Cal. 3d 35, 45, 560 P.2d 743, 136 Cal. Rptr. 854 (1977) (courts respect "administrative interpretations of a law and, unless clearly erroneous, have deemed them significant factors in ascertaining

1 statutory meaning and purpose”). The “clearly erroneous” standard was another way of  
2 requiring the courts in exercising independent judgment to give appropriate deference to the  
3 agency’s interpretation of law. See *Bodinson Mfg. Co. v. California Employment Comm’n*,  
4 17 Cal. 2d 321, 325-26, 109 P.2d 935 (1941).

5 The deference due the agency’s determination does not override the ultimate authority of  
6 the court to substitute its own judgment for that of the agency under the standard of  
7 subdivision (a), especially when constitutional questions are involved. See *People v. Louis*, 42  
8 Cal. 3d 969, 987, 728 P.2d 180, 232 Cal. Rptr. 110 (1986); Cal. Const. art. III, § 3.5.

9 Subdivision (a)(2) continues a portion of former Section 1094.5(b) (respondent has  
10 proceeded without or in excess of jurisdiction).

11 Subdivision (a)(3), providing for judicial relief if the agency has not decided all issues  
12 requiring resolution, deals with the possibility that the reviewing court may dispose of the case  
13 on the basis of issues that were not considered by the agency. An example would arise if the  
14 court had to decide on the facial constitutionality of the agency’s enabling statute where an  
15 agency is precluded from passing on the question. This provision is not intended to authorize  
16 the reviewing court initially to decide issues that are within the agency’s primary jurisdiction  
17 — such issues should first be decided by the agency, subject to the standards of judicial  
18 review provided in this article.

19 Subdivision (a)(5) changes case law that an issue of application of law to fact is treated for  
20 purposes of judicial review as an issue of fact, if the facts in the case (or inferences to be  
21 drawn from the facts) are disputed. See *S. G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Dept. of Industrial*  
22 *Relations*, 48 Cal. 3d 341, 349, 769 P.2d 399, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543 (1989). Subdivision (a)(5)  
23 broadens and applies to all application issues the case law rule that undisputed facts and  
24 inferences are treated as issues of law. See *Halaco Engineering Co. v. South Central Coast*  
25 *Regional Comm’n*, 42 Cal. 3d 52, 74-77, 720 P.2d 15, 227 Cal. Rptr. 667 (1986). Agency  
26 application of law to facts should not be confused with basic fact-finding. Typical findings of  
27 facts include determinations of what happened or will happen in the future, when it happened,  
28 and what the state of mind of the participants was. These findings may be subject to  
29 substantial evidence review under Section 1123.430 or 1123.440. After fact-finding, the  
30 agency must decide abstract legal issues that can be resolved without knowing anything of the  
31 basic facts in the case. Finally, the agency must apply the general law to the basic facts, a  
32 situation-specific application of law which will be subject to independent judgment review  
33 under Section 1123.420. See Asimow, *The Scope of Judicial Review of Decisions of*  
34 *California Administrative Agencies*, 42 UCLA L. Rev. 1157, 1211-12 (1995).

35 Agency application of law to facts should not be confused with an exercise of discretion  
36 that is based on a choice or judgment. See the Comment to Section 1123.450. Typical  
37 exercises of discretion include whether to impose a severe or lenient penalty, whether there is  
38 cause to deny a license, whether a particular land use should be permitted, and whether a  
39 corporate reorganization is fair. Asimow, *supra*, at 1224. The standard of review for an  
40 exercise of discretion is provided in Section 1123.450.

41 Under subdivision (b), Section 1123.420 does not affect case law under which legal  
42 interpretations by the Public Employment Relations Board, Agricultural Labor Relations  
43 Board, or Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board of statutes within their area of expertise  
44 have been given special deference. See, e.g., *Banning Teachers Ass’n v. Public Employment*  
45 *Relations Bd.*, 44 Cal. 3d 799, 804, 750 P.2d 313, 244 Cal. Rptr. 671 (1988); *Agricultural*  
46 *Labor Relations Bd. v. Superior Court*, 16 Cal. 3d 392, 400, 411, 546 P.2d 687, 128 Cal.  
47 *Rptr.* 183 (1976); *Judson Steel Corp. v. Workers’ Compensation Appeals Bd.*, 22 Cal. 3d 658,  
48 668, 586 P.2d 564, 150 Cal. Rptr. 250 (1978); *Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. v. Superior*  
49 *Court*, \_\_ Cal. App. 4th \_\_, \_\_ Cal. Rptr. 2d \_\_ (1996) [96 Daily Journal D.A.R. 10512,  
50 10518 (Aug. 29, 1996)]; *United Farm Workers v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd.*, 41 Cal.  
51 *App.* 4th 303, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 696, 703 (1995).

1   **§ 1123.430. Review of agency fact finding**

2       1123.430. (a) Except as provided in Section 1123.440, the standard for judicial  
3 review of whether agency action is based on an erroneous determination of fact  
4 made or implied by the agency is whether the agency's determination is  
5 supported by substantial evidence in the light of the whole record.

6       (b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), the standard for judicial review of a  
7 determination of fact made by an administrative law judge employed by the  
8 Office of Administrative Hearings that is changed by the agency head is the  
9 independent judgment of the court whether the determination is supported by  
10 the weight of the evidence.

11       **Comment.** Section 1123.430 supersedes former Section 1094.5(b)-(c) (abuse of discretion  
12 if decision not supported by findings or findings not supported by evidence).

13       Subdivision (a) eliminates for state agencies the rule of former Section 1094.5(c),  
14 providing for independent judgment review in cases where "authorized by law." The former  
15 standard was interpreted to provide for independent judgment review where a fundamental  
16 vested right is involved. *Bixby v. Pierno*, 4 Cal. 3d 130, 144, 481 P.2d 242, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234  
17 (1971); see generally Asimow, *The Scope of Judicial Review of Decisions of California*  
18 *Administrative Agencies*, 42 UCLA L. Rev. 1157, 1161-76 (1995).

19       The substantial evidence test of subdivision (a) is not a toothless standard which calls for the  
20 court merely to rubber stamp an agency's finding if there is any evidence to support it: The  
21 court must examine the evidence in the record both supporting and opposing the agency's  
22 findings. *Bixby v. Pierno*, *supra*. If a reasonable person could have made the agency's  
23 findings, the court must sustain them. But if the agency head comes to a different conclusion  
24 about credibility than the administrative law judge, the substantiality of the evidence  
25 supporting the agency's decision is called into question. *Cf.* Gov't Code § 11425.50  
26 (operative July 1, 1997).

27       In an adjudicative proceeding to which Government Code Section 11425.50 applies, the  
28 court must give great weight to a determination of the presiding officer based substantially on  
29 the credibility of a witness to the extent the determination identifies the observed demeanor,  
30 manner, or attitude of the witness that supports it. Gov't Code § 11425.50(b). Government  
31 Code Section 11425.50 applies to adjudications of most state agencies (see Gov't Code §  
32 11410.20 & Comment) and to adjudications of state and local agencies that voluntarily apply  
33 the section to the proceeding. See Gov't Code § 11410.40.

34   **§ 1123.440. Review of fact finding in local agency adjudication**

35       1123.440. The standard for judicial review of whether a decision of a local  
36 agency in an adjudicative proceeding is based on an erroneous determination of  
37 fact made or implied by the agency is:

38       (a) In cases in which the court is authorized by law to exercise its independent  
39 judgment on the evidence, the independent judgment of the court whether the  
40 determination is supported by the weight of the evidence.

41       (b) In all other cases, whether the determination is supported by substantial  
42 evidence in the light of the whole record.

43       **Comment.** Section 1123.440 continues former Section 1094.5(c) as it applied to fact-  
44 finding in local agency adjudication. See *Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees*  
45 *Retirement Ass'n*, 11 Cal. 3d 28, 32, 520 P.2d 29, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805 (1974).

1   **§ 1123.450. Review of agency exercise of discretion**

2       1123.450. (a) The standard for judicial review of whether agency action is a  
3       proper exercise of discretion, including an agency's determination under Section  
4       11342.2 of the Government Code that a regulation is reasonably necessary to  
5       effectuate the purpose of the statute that authorizes the regulation, is abuse of  
6       discretion.

7       (b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), to the extent agency exercise of discretion  
8       is based on a determination of fact made or implied by the agency, the standard  
9       for judicial review is that provided in Section 1123.430 or Section 1123.440, as  
10      appropriate.

11      **Comment.** Section 1123.450 codifies the existing authority of the court to review agency  
12      action that constitutes an exercise of agency discretion. A court may decline to exercise  
13      review of discretionary action in circumstances where the Legislature so intended or where  
14      there are no standards by which a court can conduct review. *Cf.* 5 U.S.C. § 701(a)(2) (federal  
15      APA).

16      Agency exercise of discretion should be distinguished from agency interpretation or  
17      application of law, which is subject to the standard of review prescribed in Section 1123.420.  
18      Section 1123.450 applies, for example, to a local agency land use decision as to whether a  
19      planned project is consistent with the agency's general plan. *E.g.*, *Sequoyah Hills*  
20      *Homeowners Ass'n v. City of Oakland*, 23 Cal. App. 4th 704, 717-20, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 182,  
21      189-91 (1993); *Dore v. County of Ventura*, 23 Cal. App. 4th 320, 328-29, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d  
22      299, 304 (1994). See also *Local & Regional Monitor v. City of Los Angeles*, 16 Cal. App.  
23      4th 630, 648, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 228, 239 (1993); *No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 196 Cal.  
24      App. 3d 223, 243, 242 Cal. Rptr. 37 (1987); *Greenebaum v. City of Los Angeles*, 153 Cal.  
25      App. 3d 391, 400-02, 200 Cal. Rptr. 237 (1984). Examples in the labor law field include  
26      *Independent Roofing Contractors v. Department of Industrial Relations*, 23 Cal. App. 4th  
27      345, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 550 (1994), *Pipe Trades Dist. Council No. 51 v. Aubry*, 41 Cal. App.  
28      4th 1457, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 208 (1996), and *International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers,*  
29      *Local 11 v. Aubry*, 41 Cal. App. 4th 1632, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 759 (1996), all concerning  
30      agency discretion in making prevailing wage determinations, and *International Brotherhood*  
31      *of Electrical Workers, Local 889 v. Department of Industrial Relations*, 42 Cal. App. 4th 861,  
32      50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1 (1996), concerning agency discretion in selecting an appropriate  
33      bargaining unit for transit district employees.

34      Subdivision (a) continues a portion of former Section 1094.5(b) (prejudicial abuse of  
35      discretion). Subdivisions (a) and (b) clarify the standards for court determination of abuse of  
36      discretion but do not significantly change existing law. See former Code Civ. Proc. §  
37      1094.5(c) (administrative mandamus); Gov't Code § 11350(b) (review of regulations). The  
38      reference in subdivision (a) to an agency determination under Government Code Section  
39      11342.2 that a regulation is reasonably necessary continues existing law. See *Moore v. State*  
40      *Board of Accountancy*, 2 Cal. 4th 999, 1015, 831 P.2d 798, 9 Cal. Rptr. 2d 358, 367 (1992);  
41      *California Ass'n of Psychology Providers v. Rank*, 51 Cal. 3d 1, 11, 793 P.2d 2, 270 Cal.  
42      Rptr. 796 (1990).

43      The standard for reviewing agency discretionary action is whether there is abuse of  
44      discretion. The analysis consists of two elements. First, to the extent that the discretionary  
45      action is based on factual determinations, there must be substantial evidence in the light of the  
46      whole record in support of those factual determinations. This is the same standard that a court  
47      uses to review state agency findings of fact generally. See Section 1123.430. However,  
48      discretionary action such as agency rulemaking is frequently based on findings of legislative  
49      rather than adjudicative facts. Legislative facts are general in nature and are necessary for  
50      making law or policy (as opposed to adjudicative facts which are specific to the conduct of  
51      particular parties). Legislative facts are often scientific, technical, or economic in nature.

Often, the determination of such facts requires specialized expertise and the fact findings involve guesswork or prophecy. A reviewing court must be appropriately deferential to agency findings of legislative fact and should not demand that such facts be proved with certainty. Nevertheless, a court can still legitimately review the rationality of legislative fact finding in light of the evidence in the whole record.

Second, discretionary action is based on a choice or judgment. A court reviews this choice by asking whether there is abuse of discretion in light of the record and the reasons stated by the agency. See Section 1123.820(d) (agency must supply reasons when necessary for proper judicial review). This standard is often encompassed by the terms “arbitrary” or “capricious.” The court must not substitute its judgment for that of the agency, but the agency action must be rational. See Asimow, *The Scope of Judicial Review of Decisions of California Administrative Agencies*, 42 UCLA L. Rev. 1157, 1228-29 (1995). Abuse of discretion is established if it appears from the record viewed as a whole that the agency action is unreasonable, arbitrary, or capricious. Cf. ABA Section on Administrative Law, Restatement of Scope of Review Doctrine, 38 Admin. L. Rev. 235 (1986) (grounds for reversal include policy judgment so unacceptable or reasoning so illogical as to make agency action arbitrary, or agency’s failure in other respects to use reasoned decisionmaking).

#### § 1123.460. Review of agency procedure

1123.460. The standard for judicial review of the following issues is the independent judgment of the court, giving deference to the agency’s determination of appropriate procedures:

(a) Whether the agency has engaged in an unlawful procedure or decisionmaking process, or has failed to follow prescribed procedure.

(b) Whether the persons taking the agency action were improperly constituted as a decisionmaking body or subject to disqualification.

**Comment.** Section 1123.460 codifies existing law concerning the independent judgment of the court and the deference due agency determination of procedures. Cf. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(D) (federal APA); *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976).

Section 1123.460 is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-116(c)(5)-(6). It continues a portion of former Section 1094.5(b) (inquiry of the court extends to questions whether there has been a fair trial or the agency has not proceeded in the manner required by law). One example of an agency’s failure to follow prescribed procedure is the agency’s failure to act within the prescribed time upon a matter submitted to the agency.

The degree of deference to be given to the agency’s determination under Section 1123.460 is for the court to determine. The deference is not absolute. Ultimately, the court must still use its judgment on the issue.

#### § 1123.470. Burden of persuasion

1123.470. Except as otherwise provided by statute, the burden of demonstrating the invalidity of agency action is on the party asserting the invalidity.

**Comment.** Section 1123.470 codifies existing law. See California Administrative Mandamus §§ 4.157, 12.7 (Cal. Cont. Ed. Bar, 2d ed. 1989). It is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-116(a)(1).

Article 5. Superior Court Jurisdiction and Venue

§ 1123.510. Superior court jurisdiction

1123.510. (a) Except as otherwise provided by statute, jurisdiction for judicial review under this chapter is in the superior court.

(b) Nothing in this section prevents the Supreme Court or courts of appeal from exercising original jurisdiction under Section 10 of Article VI of the California Constitution.

**Comment.** Section 1123.510 is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-104, alternative A. Under prior law, except where the issues were of great public importance and had to be resolved promptly or where otherwise provided by statute, the superior court was the proper court for administrative mandamus proceedings. See *Mooney v. Pickett*, 4 Cal. 3d 669, 674-75, 483 P.2d 1231, 94 Cal. Rptr. 279 (1971). Although the Supreme Court and courts of appeal may exercise original mandamus jurisdiction in exceptional circumstances, the superior court is in a better position to determine questions of fact than is an appellate tribunal and is therefore the preferred court. *Roma Macaroni Factory v. Giambastiani*, 219 Cal. 435, 437, 27 P.2d 371 (1933).

The introductory clause of Section 1123.510 recognizes that statutes applicable to particular proceedings provide that judicial review is in the court of appeal or Supreme Court. See Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090 (Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board and Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control); Gov't Code §§ 3520(c), 3542(c), 3564(c) (Public Employment Relations Board); Lab. Code §§ 1160.8 (Agricultural Labor Relations Board), 5950 (Workers' Compensation Appeals Board).

§ 1123.520. Superior court venue

1123.520. (a) Except as otherwise provided by statute, the proper county for judicial review under this chapter is:

(1) In the case of state agency action, the county where the cause of action, or some part thereof, arose, or Sacramento County.

(2) In the case of local agency action, the county or counties of jurisdiction of the agency.

(b) A proceeding under this chapter may be transferred on the grounds and in the manner provided for transfer of a civil action under Title 4 (commencing with Section 392) of Part 2.

**Comment.** Subdivision (a)(1) of Section 1123.520 continues prior law for judicial review of state agency action, with the addition of Sacramento County. See Code Civ. Proc. § 393(1)(b); California Administrative Mandamus § 8.16, at 269 (Cal. Cont. Ed. Bar, 2d ed. 1989); *Duval v. Contractors State License Bd.*, 125 Cal. App. 2d 532, 271 P.2d 194 (1954). Subdivision (a)(2) is new, but is probably not a substantive change, since the cause of action is likely to arise in the county of the local agency's jurisdiction.

Under subdivision (b), a case filed in the wrong county should not be dismissed, but should be transferred to the proper county. See Sections 1123.710(a) (applicability of rules of practice for civil actions), 396b. Cf. *Padilla v. Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control*, 43 Cal. App. 4th 1151, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 133 (1996) (transfer from court lacking jurisdiction).

The venue rules of Section 1123.520 are subject to a conflicting or inconsistent statute applicable to a particular entity (Section 1121.110), such as Business and Professions Code Section 2019 (venue for proceedings against the Medical Board of California). For venue of judicial review of a decision of a private hospital board, see Health & Safety Code § 1339.63(b).

Article 6. Petition for Review; Time Limits

**§ 1123.610. Petition for review**

1123.610. (a) A person seeking judicial review of agency action may initiate judicial review by filing a petition for review with the court.

(b) The petition shall name as respondent only the agency whose action is at issue or the agency head by title, and not individual employees of the agency.

(c) The petitioner shall cause a copy of the petition for review to be served on the other parties in the same manner as service of a summons in a civil action.

**Comment.** Subdivision (a) of Section 1123.610 supersedes the first sentence of former Government Code Section 11523.

Subdivision (b) codifies existing practice. See California Administrative Mandamus §§ 6.1-6.3, at 225-27 (Cal. Cont. Ed. Bar, 2d ed. 1989). Although the petition may name the agency head as a respondent by title, subdivision (b) makes clear “agency” does not include individual employees of the agency. See Sections 1121.230 (“agency” defined), 1121.210 (definitions vary as required by the provision).

Subdivision (c) continues existing practice. See California Administrative Mandamus §§ 8.48, 9.17, 9.23, at 298-99, 320, 326 (Cal. Cont. Ed. Bar 1989). Since the petition for review serves the purpose of the alternative writ of mandamus or notice of motion under prior law, a summons is not required. See California Administrative Mandamus, *supra*, §§ 9.8, 9.21, at 315, 324.

**§ 1123.620. Contents of petition for review**

1123.620. The petition for review shall state all of the following:

(a) The name of the petitioner.

(b) The address and telephone number of the petitioner or, if the petitioner is represented by an attorney, of the petitioner’s attorney.

(c) The name and mailing address of the agency whose action is at issue.

(d) Identification of the agency action at issue, together with a duplicate copy, summary, or brief description of the agency action.

(e) Identification of persons who were parties in any adjudicative proceedings that led to the agency action.

(f) Facts to demonstrate that the petitioner is entitled to judicial review.

(g) The reasons why relief should be granted.

(h) A request for relief, specifying the type and extent of relief requested.

**Comment.** Section 1123.620 is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-109.

**§ 1123.630. Notice to parties of last day to file petition for review**

1123.630. In an adjudicative proceeding, the agency shall in the decision or otherwise give notice to the parties in substantially the following form: “The last day to file a petition with a court for review of the decision is [date] unless the time is extended as provided by law.”

**Comment.** Section 1123.630 is drawn from and generalizes former Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6(f). See also Unemp. Ins. Code § 410; Veh. Code § 14401(b). For provisions extending the time to petition for review, see Sections 1123.640, 1123.650. An agency notice that erroneously shows a date that is too soon does not shorten the period for

review, since the substantive rules in Sections 1123.640 or 1123.650 govern. If the notice erroneously shows a date that is later than the last day to petition for review and the petition is filed before that later date, the agency may be estopped to assert that the time has expired. See *Ginns v. Savage*, 61 Cal. 2d 520, 523-25, 393 P.2d 689, 39 Cal. Rptr. 377 (1964).

**§ 1123.640. Time for filing petition for review in adjudication of state agency and formal adjudication of local agency**

1123.640. (a) The petition for review of a decision of a state agency in an adjudicative proceeding, and of a decision of any agency in a proceeding under Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code, shall be filed not later than 30 days after the decision is effective or after the notice required by Section 1123.630 is delivered, served, or mailed, whichever is later.

(b) For the purpose of this section:

(1) A decision in a proceeding under Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code is effective at the time provided in Section 11519 of the Government Code.

(2) A decision of a state agency in an adjudicative proceeding other than under Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code is effective 30 days after it is delivered or mailed to the person to which the decision is directed, unless any of the following conditions exist:

(A) A reconsideration is ordered within that time pursuant to express statute or rule.

(B) The agency orders that the decision is effective sooner.

(C) A stay is granted.

(D) A different effective date is provided by statute or regulation.

(c) The time for filing the petition for review is extended for a party during any period when the party is seeking reconsideration of the decision pursuant to express statute or rule, but in no case shall a petition for review of a decision described in subdivision (a) be filed later than one hundred eighty days after the decision is effective.

**Comment.** Section 1123.640 provides a limitation period for initiating judicial review of specified agency adjudicative decisions. See Section 1121.250 (“decision” defined). See also Section 1123.650 (time for filing petition in other adjudicative proceedings). This preserves the distinction in existing law between limitation of judicial review of quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial agency actions. Other types of agency action may be subject to other limitation periods, or to equitable doctrines such as laches.

Subdivision (a) supersedes the second sentence of former Government Code Section 11523 (30 days). It also unifies the review periods formerly found in various special statutes. See, e.g., Gov’t Code §§ 3542 (Public Employment Relations Board), 65907 (local zoning appeals board); Lab. Code §§ 1160.8 (Agricultural Labor Relations Board), 5950 (Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board); Veh. Code § 13559 (Department of Motor Vehicles).

Section 1123.640 does not override special limitations periods statutorily preserved for policy reasons, such as for judicial review of an administratively-issued withholding order for taxes (Code Civ. Proc. § 706.075), notice of deficiency of an assessment due from a producer under a commodity marketing program (Food & Agric. Code §§ 59234.5, 60016), State

Personnel Board (Gov't Code § 19630), cancellation by a city or county of a contract limiting use of agricultural land under the Williamson Act (Gov't Code § 51286), California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Res. Code § 21167), decision of local legislative body adopting or amending a general or specific plan, regulation attached to a specific plan, or development agreement (Gov't Code § 65009), cease and desist order of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission and complaint by BCDC for administrative civil liability (Gov't Code §§ 66639, 66641.7), Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board (Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 410, 1243), certain driver's license orders (Veh. Code § 14401(a)), or welfare decisions of the Department of Social Services (Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962). See Section 1121.110 (conflicting or inconsistent statute controls). For a special statute on the effective date of a decision, see Veh. Code § 13953.

The time within which judicial review must be initiated under subdivision (a) begins to run on the date the decision is effective. A decision under the formal hearing procedure of the Administrative Procedure Act generally is effective 30 days after it becomes final, unless the agency head makes it effective sooner or stays its effective date. See Gov't Code § 11519. Judicial review may only be had of a final decision. Section 1123.120 (finality).

Nothing in this section overrides standard restrictions on application of statutes of limitations, such as estoppel to plead the statute (see, e.g., *Giins v. Savage*, 61 Cal. 2d 520, 393 P.2d 689, 39 Cal. Rptr. 377 (1964)), correction of technical defects (see, e.g., *United Farm Workers of America v. ALRB*, 37 Cal. 3d 912, 694 P.2d 138, 210 Cal. Rptr. 453 (1985)), computation of time (see Gov't Code §§ 6800-6807), and application of due process principles to a notice of decision (see, e.g., *State Farm Fire & Casualty v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Bd.*, 119 Cal. App. 3d 193, 173 Cal. Rptr. 778 (1981)).

#### **§ 1123.650. Time for filing petition for review in other adjudicative proceedings**

1123.650. (a) The petition for review of a decision in an adjudicative proceeding, other than a decision governed by Section 1123.640, shall be filed not later than 90 days after the decision is announced or after the notice required by Section 1123.630 is given, whichever is later.

(b) The time for filing the petition for review is extended as to a party during any period when the party is seeking reconsideration of the decision pursuant to express statute, regulation, charter, or ordinance, but in no case shall a petition for review of a decision described in subdivision (a) be filed later than one hundred eighty days after the decision is announced or reconsideration is rejected, whichever is later.

**Comment.** Section 1123.650 continues the 90-day limitations period for local agency adjudication in former Section 1094.6(b).

### **Article 7. Review Procedure**

#### **§ 1123.710. Applicability of rules of practice for civil actions**

1123.710. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title or by rules of court adopted by the Judicial Council not inconsistent with this title, Part 2 (commencing with Section 307) applies to proceedings under this title.

(b) The following provisions of Part 2 (commencing with Section 307) do not apply to a proceeding under this title:

(1) Section 426.30.

(2) Subdivision (a) of Section 1013.

1 (c) A party may obtain discovery in a proceeding under this title only of the  
2 following:

3 (1) Matters reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of evidence  
4 admissible under Section 1123.850.

5 (2) Matters in possession of the agency for the purpose of determining the  
6 accuracy of the affidavit of the agency official who compiled the administrative  
7 record for judicial review.

8 **Comment.** Subdivision (a) of Section 1123.710 continues the effect of Section 1109 in  
9 proceedings under this title. For example, under Section 632, upon the request of any party  
10 appearing at the trial, the court shall issue a statement of decision explaining the factual and  
11 legal basis for its decision as to each of the principal controverted issues at trial. See *Delany v.*  
12 *Toomey*, 111 Cal. App. 2d 570, 571-72, 245 P.2d 26 (1952).

13 Under subdivision (b)(1), the compulsory cross-complaint provisions of Section 426.30 do  
14 not apply to judicial review under this title.

15 Subdivision (b)(2) provides that the provisions of Section 1013(a) for extension of time  
16 when notice is mailed do not apply to judicial review under this title. This continues prior law  
17 for judicial review of local agency action under former Section 1094.6. *Tielsch v. City of*  
18 *Anaheim*, 160 Cal. App. 3d 576, 206 Cal. Rptr. 740 (1984). Prior law was unclear whether  
19 Section 1013(a) applied to judicial review of state agency proceedings under former Section  
20 1094.5. See California Administrative Mandamus § 7.4, at 242 (Cal. Cont. Ed. Bar, 2d ed.  
21 1989). For statutes providing that Section 1013 does apply, see Lab. Code § 98.2; Veh. Code  
22 § 40230. These statutes prevail over Section 1123.710(b)(2). See Section 1121.110  
23 (conflicting or inconsistent statute controls)

24 Subdivision (c)(1) codifies *City of Fairfield v. Superior Court*, 14 Cal. 3d 768, 774-75, 537  
25 P.2d 375, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543 (1975). The affidavit referred to in subdivision (c)(2) is  
26 provided for in Section 1123.820.

## 27 § 1123.720. Stay of agency action

28 1123.720. (a) The filing of a petition for review under this title does not of itself  
29 stay or suspend the operation of any agency action.

30 (b) Subject to subdivision (g), on application of the petitioner, the reviewing  
31 court may grant a stay of the agency action pending the judgment of the court if  
32 it finds that all of the following conditions are satisfied:

33 (1) The petitioner is likely to prevail ultimately on the merits.

34 (2) Without a stay the petitioner will suffer irreparable injury.

35 (3) The grant of a stay to the petitioner will not cause substantial harm to  
36 others.

37 (4) The grant of a stay to the petitioner will not substantially threaten the public  
38 health, safety, or welfare.

39 (c) The application for a stay shall be accompanied by proof of service of a  
40 copy of the application on the agency. Service shall be made in the same manner  
41 as service of a summons in a civil action.

42 (d) The court may condition a stay on appropriate terms, including the giving of  
43 security for the protection of parties or others.

44 (e) If an appeal is taken from a denial of relief by the superior court, the agency  
45 action shall not be further stayed except on order of the court to which the  
46 appeal is taken. However, in cases where a stay is in effect at the time of filing the

1 notice of appeal, the stay is continued by operation of law for a period of 20 days  
2 after the filing of the notice.

3 (f) Except as provided by statute, if an appeal is taken from a granting of relief  
4 by the superior court, the agency action is stayed pending the determination of  
5 the appeal unless the court to which the appeal is taken orders otherwise.  
6 Notwithstanding Section 916, the court to which the appeal is taken may direct  
7 that the appeal shall not stay the granting of relief by the superior court.

8 (g) No stay may be granted to prevent or enjoin the state or an officer of the  
9 state from collecting a tax.

10 **Comment.** Section 1123.720 is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-111, and  
11 supersedes former Section 1094.5(g)-(h).

12 Subdivision (b)(1) generalizes the requirement of former Section 1094.5(h)(1) that a stay  
13 may not be granted unless the petitioner is likely to prevail on the merits. The former  
14 provision applied only to a decision of a licensed hospital or state agency made after a  
15 hearing under the formal hearing provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

16 Subdivision (b)(1) requires more than a conclusion that a possible viable defense exists.  
17 The court must make a preliminary assessment of the merits of the judicial review proceeding  
18 and conclude that the petitioner is likely to obtain relief in that proceeding. *Medical Bd. of*  
19 *California v. Superior Court*, 227 Cal. App. 3d 1458, 1461, 278 Cal. Rptr. 247 (1991); *Board*  
20 *of Medical Quality Assurance v. Superior Court*, 114 Cal. App. 3d 272, 276, 170 Cal. Rptr.  
21 468 (1980).

22 Subdivision (c) continues a portion of the second sentence and all of the third sentence of  
23 former Section 1094.5(g), and a portion of the second sentence and all of the third sentence  
24 of former Section 1094.5(h)(1).

25 Subdivision (d) codifies case law. See *Venice Canals Resident Home Owners Ass'n v.*  
26 *Superior Court*, 72 Cal. App. 3d 675, 140 Cal. Rptr. 361 (1977) (stay conditioned on posting  
27 bond).

28 Subdivision (e) continues the fourth and fifth sentences of former Section 1094.5(g) and  
29 the first and second sentences of former Section 1094.5(h)(3).

30 The first sentence of subdivision (f) continues the sixth sentence of former Section  
31 1094.5(g) and the third sentence of former Section 1094.5(h)(3). The introductory clause of  
32 the first sentence recognizes that statutes may provide special stay rules for particular  
33 proceedings. See, e.g., Section 1110a (proceedings concerning irrigation water). The second  
34 sentence of subdivision (f) is drawn from Section 1110b, and replaces Section 1110b for  
35 judicial review proceedings under this title.

36 Subdivision (g) recognizes that the California Constitution provides that no legal or  
37 equitable process shall issue against the state or any officer of the state to prevent or enjoin  
38 the collection of any tax. Cal. Const. art. XIII, § 32.

39 A decision in a formal adjudicative proceeding under the Administrative Procedure Act  
40 may also be stayed by the agency. Gov't Code § 11519(b).

#### 41 § 1123.730. Type of relief

42 1123.730. (a) Subject to subdivision (c), the court may grant appropriate relief  
43 justified by the general set of facts alleged in the petition for review, whether  
44 mandatory, injunctive, or declaratory, preliminary or final, temporary or permanent,  
45 equitable or legal. In granting relief, the court may order agency action required  
46 by law, order agency exercise of discretion required by law, set aside or modify  
47 agency action, enjoin or stay the effectiveness of agency action, remand the  
48 matter for further proceedings, render a declaratory judgment, or take any other

1 action that is authorized and appropriate. The court may grant necessary ancillary  
2 relief to redress the effects of official action wrongfully taken or withheld.

3 (b) The court may award damages or compensation, subject to Division 3.6  
4 (commencing with Section 810) of the Government Code, if applicable, and to  
5 other express statute.

6 (c) In reviewing a decision in a proceeding in a state agency adjudication  
7 subject to Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 11400) of Part 1 of Division 3  
8 of Title 2 of the Government Code, the court shall enter judgment either  
9 commanding the agency to set aside the decision or denying relief. If the  
10 judgment commands that the decision be set aside, the court may order  
11 reconsideration of the case in light of the court's opinion and judgment and may  
12 order the agency to take further action that is specially enjoined upon it by law.

13 (d) The court may award attorney's fees or witness fees only to the extent  
14 expressly authorized by statute.

15 (e) If the court sets aside or modifies agency action or remands the matter for  
16 further proceedings, the court may make any interlocutory order necessary to  
17 preserve the interests of the parties and the public pending further proceedings or  
18 agency action.

19 **Comment.** Section 1123.730 is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-117, and  
20 supersedes former Section 1094.5(f). Section 1123.730 makes clear that the single form of  
21 action established by Sections 1121.120 and 1123.610 encompasses any appropriate type of  
22 relief, with the exceptions indicated.

23 Subdivision (b) continues the effect of Code of Civil Procedure Section 1095 permitting  
24 the court to award damages in an appropriate case. Under subdivision (b), the court may  
25 award damages or compensation subject to the Tort Claims Act "if applicable." The claim  
26 presentation requirements of the Tort Claims Act do not apply, for example, to a claim  
27 against a local public entity for earned salary or wages. Gov't Code § 905(c). See also *Snipes*  
28 *City of Bakersfield*, 145 Cal. App. 3d 861, 193 Cal. Rptr. 760 (1983) (claims requirements of  
29 Tort Claims Act do not apply to actions under Fair Employment and Housing Act); *O'Hagan*  
30 *v. Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 38 Cal. App. 3d 722, 729, 113 Cal. Rptr. 501, 506 (1974)  
31 (claim for damages for revocation of use permit subject to Tort Claims Act); *Eureka*  
32 *Teacher's Ass'n v. Board of Educ.*, 202 Cal. App. 3d 469, 475-76, 247 Cal. Rptr. 790 (1988)  
33 (action seeking damages incidental to extraordinary relief not subject to claims requirements  
34 of Tort Claims Act); *Loehr v. Ventura County Community College Dist.*, 147 Cal. App. 3d  
35 1071, 1081, 195 Cal. Rptr. 576 (1983) (action primarily for money damages seeking  
36 extraordinary relief incidental to damages is subject to claims requirements of Tort Claims  
37 Act). Nothing in Section 1123.730 authorizes the court to interfere with a valid exercise of  
38 agency discretion or to direct an agency how to exercise its discretion. Section 1121.140.

39 Subdivision (c) continues the first sentence and first portion of the second sentence of  
40 former Section 1094.5(f).

41 For statutes authorizing an award of attorney's fees, see Sections 1028.5, 1123.950. See  
42 also Gov't Code §§ 68092.5 (expert witness fees), 68093 (mileage and fees in civil cases in  
43 superior court), 68096.1-68097.10 (witness fees of public officers and employees). Cf. Gov't  
44 Code § 11450.40 (fees for witness appearing in APA proceeding pursuant to subpoena)  
45 (operative July 1, 1997).

#### 46 § 1123.740. Jury trial

47 1123.740. All proceedings shall be heard by the court sitting without a jury.

1     **Comment.** Section 1123.740 continues a portion of the first sentence of former Section  
2     1094.5(a).

## 3                                   Article 8. Record for Judicial Review

### 4     **§ 1123.810. Administrative record exclusive basis for judicial review**

5         1123.810. Except as provided in Section 1123.850 or as otherwise provided by  
6         statute, the administrative record is the exclusive basis for judicial review of  
7         agency action.

8         **Comment.** Section 1123.810 codifies existing practice. See, e.g., Beverly Hills Fed. Sav. &  
9         Loan Ass'n v. Superior Court, 259 Cal. App. 2d 306, 324, 66 Cal. Rptr. 183, 192 (1968). For  
10        authority to augment the administrative record for judicial review, see Section 1123.850 (new  
11        evidence on judicial review).

### 12    **§ 1123.820. Contents of administrative record**

13         1123.820. (a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), the administrative record  
14         for judicial review of agency action consists of all of the following:

15            (1) Any agency documents expressing the agency action.

16            (2) Other documents identified by the agency as having been considered by it  
17            before its action and used as a basis for its action.

18            (3) All material submitted to the agency in connection with the agency action.

19            (4) A transcript of any hearing, if one was maintained, or minutes of the  
20            proceeding. In case of electronic reporting of proceedings, the transcript or a  
21            copy of the electronic reporting shall be part of the administrative record in  
22            accordance with the rules applicable to the record on appeal in judicial  
23            proceedings.

24            (5) Any other material described by statute as the administrative record for the  
25            type of agency action at issue.

26            (6) A table of contents that identifies each item contained in the record and  
27            includes an affidavit of the agency official who has compiled the administrative  
28            record for judicial review specifying the date on which the record was closed and  
29            that the record is complete.

30         (b) The administrative record for judicial review of rulemaking under Chapter  
31         3.5 (commencing with Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the  
32         Government Code is the file of the rulemaking proceeding prescribed by Section  
33         11347.3 of the Government Code.

34         (c) By stipulation of all parties to judicial review proceedings, the administrative  
35         record for judicial review may be shortened, summarized, or organized, or may be  
36         an agreed or settled statement of the parties, in accordance with the rules  
37         applicable to the record on appeal in judicial proceedings.

38         (d) If an explanation of reasons for the agency action is not otherwise included  
39         in the administrative record, the court may require the agency to add to the  
40         administrative record for judicial review a brief explanation of the reasons for the  
41         agency action to the extent necessary for proper judicial review.

1     **Comment.** Section 1123.820 is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-115(a), (d),  
2     (f)-(g). For authority to augment the administrative record for judicial review, see Section  
3     1123.850 (new evidence on judicial review). The administrative record for judicial review is  
4     related but not necessarily identical to the record of agency proceedings that is prepared and  
5     maintained by the agency. The administrative record for judicial review specified in this  
6     section is subject to the provisions of this section on shortening, summarizing, or organizing  
7     the record, or stipulation to an agreed or settled statement of the parties. Subdivision (c).

8     Subdivision (a) supersedes the seventh sentence of former Government Code Section  
9     11523 (judicial review of formal adjudicative proceedings under Administrative Procedure  
10    Act). In the case of an adjudicative proceeding, the record will include the final decision and  
11    all notices and orders issued by the agency (subdivision (a)(1)), any proposed decision by an  
12    administrative law judge (subdivision (a)(2)), the pleadings, the exhibits admitted or rejected,  
13    and the written evidence and any other papers in the case (subdivision (a)(3)), and a transcript  
14    of all proceedings (subdivision (a)(4)).

15    Treatment of the record in the case of electronic reporting of proceedings in subdivision  
16    (a)(4) is derived from Rule 980.5 of the California Rules of Court (electronic recording as  
17    official record of proceedings).

18    The requirement of a table of contents in subdivision (a)(6) is drawn from Government  
19    Code Section 11347.3 (rulemaking). The affidavit requirement may be satisfied by a  
20    declaration under penalty of perjury. Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5.

21    Subdivision (d) supersedes the case law requirement of Topanga Ass'n for a Scenic  
22    Community v. County of Los Angeles, 11 Cal. 3d 506, 522 P.2d 12, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836  
23    (1974), that adjudicative decisions reviewed under former Section 1094.5 be explained, and  
24    extends it to other agency action such as rulemaking and discretionary action. The court  
25    should not require an explanation of the agency action if it is not necessary for proper  
26    judicial review, for example if the explanation is obvious. A decision in an adjudicative  
27    proceeding under the Administrative Procedure Act must include a statement of the factual  
28    and legal basis for the decision. Gov't Code § 11425.50 (decision) (operative July 1, 1997).

29    If there is an issue of completeness of the administrative record, the court may permit  
30    limited discovery of the agency file for the purpose of determining the accuracy of the  
31    affidavit of completeness. See Section 1123.710(c) (discovery in judicial review proceeding).  
32    A party is not entitled to discovery of material in the agency file that is privileged. See, e.g.,  
33    Gov't Code § 6254 (exemptions from California Public Records Act). Moreover, the  
34    administrative record reflects the actual documents that are the basis of the agency action.  
35    Except as provided in subdivision (d), the agency cannot be ordered to prepare a document  
36    that does not exist, such as a summary of an oral ex parte contact in a case where the contact  
37    is permissible and no other documentation requirement exists. If judicial review reveals that  
38    the agency action is not supported by the record, the court may grant appropriate relief,  
39    including setting aside, modifying, enjoining, or staying the agency action, or remanding for  
40    further proceedings. Section 1123.730.

#### 41    **§ 1123.830. Preparation of record**

42    1123.830. (a) On request of the petitioner for the administrative record for  
43    judicial review of agency action:

44    (1) If the agency action is a decision in an adjudicative proceeding required to  
45    be conducted by an administrative law judge employed by the Office of  
46    Administrative Hearings, the administrative record shall be prepared by the Office  
47    of Administrative Hearings.

48    (2) If the agency action is other than that described in paragraph (1), the  
49    administrative record shall be prepared by the agency.

(b) Except as otherwise provided by statute, the administrative record shall be delivered to the petitioner as follows:

(1) Within 30 days after the request in an adjudicative proceeding involving an evidentiary hearing of 10 days or less.

(2) Within 60 days after the request in a nonadjudicative proceeding, or in an adjudicative proceeding involving an evidentiary hearing of more than 10 days.

(c) The time limits provided in subdivision (b) may be extended by the court for good cause shown.

**Comment.** Section 1123.830 supersedes the fourth sentence of former Government Code Section 11523 and the first sentence of subdivision (c) of former Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. Under former Section 11523, in judicial review of proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act, the record was to be prepared either by the Office of Administrative Hearings or by the agency. However, in practice the record was prepared by the Office of Administrative Hearings, consistent with subdivision (a)(1).

Although Section 1123.830 requires the Office of Administrative Hearings or the agency to prepare the record, the burden is on the petitioner attacking the administrative decision to show entitlement to judicial relief, so it is petitioner's responsibility to make the administrative record available to the court. *Foster v. Civil Service Comm'n*, 142 Cal. App. 3d 444, 453, 190 Cal. Rptr. 893, 899 (1983). However, this does not authorize use of an unofficial record for judicial review.

The introductory clause of subdivision (b) recognizes that some statutes prescribe the time to prepare the record in particular proceedings. See, e.g., Gov't Code § 3564 (10-day limit for Public Employment Relations Board).

#### **§ 1123.840. Disposal of administrative record**

1123.840. Any administrative record received for filing by the clerk of the court may be disposed of as provided in Sections 1952, 1952.2, and 1952.3.

**Comment.** Section 1123.840 continues former Section 1094.5(i) without change.

#### **§ 1123.850. New evidence on judicial review**

1123.850. (a) If the court finds that there is relevant evidence that, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have been produced or that was improperly excluded in the agency proceedings, it may enter judgment remanding the case for reconsideration in the light of that evidence. Except as provided in this section, the court shall not admit the evidence on judicial review without remanding the case.

(b) The court may receive evidence described in subdivision (a) without remanding the case in any of the following circumstances:

(1) The evidence relates to the validity of the agency action and is needed to decide (i) improper constitution as a decision making body, or grounds for disqualification, of those taking the agency action, or (ii) unlawfulness of procedure or of decision making process.

(2) The agency action is a decision in an adjudicative proceeding and the evidence relates to an issue for which the standard of review is the independent judgment of the court.

1 (c) Whether or not the evidence is described in subdivision (a), the court may  
2 receive evidence in addition to that contained in the administrative record for  
3 judicial review without remanding the case if no hearing was held by the agency,  
4 and the court finds that (i) remand to the agency would be unlikely to result in a  
5 better record for review and (ii) the interests of economy and efficiency would be  
6 served by receiving the evidence itself. This subdivision does not apply to judicial  
7 review of rulemaking.

8 (d) If jurisdiction for judicial review is in the Supreme Court or court of appeal  
9 and the court is to receive evidence pursuant to this section, the court shall  
10 appoint a referee, master, or trial court judge for this purpose, having due regard  
11 for the convenience of the parties.

12 (e) Nothing in this section precludes the court from taking judicial notice of a  
13 decision designated by the agency as a precedent decision pursuant to Section  
14 11425.60 of the Government Code.

15 **Comment.** Subdivision (a) of Section 1123.850 supersedes former Section 1094.5(e),  
16 which permitted the court to admit evidence without remanding the case in cases in which the  
17 court was authorized by law to exercise its independent judgment on the evidence. Under this  
18 section and Section 1123.810, the court is limited to evidence in the administrative record  
19 except under subdivision (b). The provision in subdivision (a) permitting new evidence that  
20 could not in the exercise of reasonable diligence have been produced in the administrative  
21 proceeding should be narrowly construed. Such evidence is admissible only in rare instances.  
22 See *Western States Petroleum Ass'n v. Superior Court*, 9 Cal. 4th 559, 578, 888 P.2d 1268, 38  
23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 139, 149 (1995).

24 Subdivision (b)(1) is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-114(a)(1)-(2). It  
25 permits the court to receive evidence, subject to a number of conditions. First, evidence may  
26 be received only if it is likely to contribute to the court's determination of the validity of  
27 agency action under one or more of the standards set forth in Sections 1123.410-1123.460.  
28 Second, it identifies some specific issues that may be addressed, if necessary, by new evidence.  
29 Since subdivision (b)(1) permits the court to receive disputed evidence only if needed to  
30 decide disputed "issues," this provision is applicable only with regard to "issues" that are  
31 properly before the court. See Section 1123.350 on limitation of new issues.

32 Subdivision (b)(2) applies to judicial review of agency interpretation of law or application  
33 of law to facts under Section 1123.420, and to fact finding in local agency proceedings to  
34 which the independent judgment standard applies under Section 1123.440. Admission of  
35 evidence under this provision is discretionary with the court.

36 As used in subdivision (c), "hearing" includes both informal and formal hearings.

37 Subdivision (d) is drawn from 1981 Model State APA Section 5-104(c), alternative B.  
38 Statutes that provide for judicial review in the court of appeal or Supreme Court are: Bus. &  
39 Prof. Code § 23090 (Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board and Department of  
40 Alcoholic Beverage Control); Gov't Code §§ 3520(c), 3542(c), 3564(c) (Public Employment  
41 Relations Board); Lab. Code §§ 1160.8 (Agricultural Labor Relations Board), 5950  
42 (Workers' Compensation Appeals Board).

43 Section 1123.850 deals only with admissibility of new evidence on issues involved in the  
44 agency proceeding. It does not limit evidence on issues unique to judicial review, such as  
45 petitioner's standing or capacity, or affirmative defenses such as laches for unreasonable  
46 delay in seeking judicial review. For standing rules, see Sections 1123.210-1123.240.

47 Subdivision (e) makes clear this section does not prevent the court from taking judicial  
48 notice of a precedent decision. See Evid. Code § 452.

1 For a special rule requiring the court to consider all relevant evidence, see Water Code §  
2 1813. This special rule prevails over Section 1123.850. See Section 1121.120 (conflicting or  
3 inconsistent statute controls).

#### 4 Article 9. Costs and Fees

##### 5 **§ 1123.910. Fee for transcript and preparation and certification of record**

6 1123.910. The agency preparing the administrative record for judicial review  
7 shall charge the petitioner the fee provided in Section 69950 of the Government  
8 Code for the transcript, if any, and the reasonable cost of preparation of other  
9 portions of the record and certification of the record.

10 **Comment.** Section 1123.910 continues the substance of a portion of the fourth sentence of  
11 former Section 11523 of the Government Code, the third sentence of subdivision (a) of  
12 former Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, and the second sentence of subdivision (c) of  
13 former Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6.

##### 14 **§ 1123.920. Recovery of costs of suit**

15 1123.920. Except as otherwise provided by rules of court adopted by the  
16 Judicial Council, the prevailing party is entitled to recover the following costs of  
17 suit borne by the party:

- 18 (a) The cost of preparing the transcript, if any.
- 19 (b) The cost of compiling and certifying the record.
- 20 (c) Any filing fee.
- 21 (d) Fees for service of documents on the other party.

22 **Comment.** Section 1123.920 supersedes the sixth sentence of subdivision (a) of former  
23 Section 1094.5, and the fifth and tenth sentences of former Section 11523 of the Government  
24 Code. Section 1123.920 generalizes these provisions to apply to all proceedings for judicial  
25 review of agency action. See also Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.3 (recovery of costs of  
26 investigation and enforcement in a disciplinary proceeding by a board in the Department of  
27 Consumer Affairs or the Osteopathic Medical Board).

##### 28 **§ 1123.930. No renewal or reinstatement of license on failure to pay costs**

29 1123.930. No license of a petitioner for judicial review of a decision in an  
30 adjudicative proceeding under Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of  
31 Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code shall be renewed or  
32 reinstated if the petitioner fails to pay all of the costs required under Section  
33 1123.920.

34 **Comment.** Section 1123.930 continues the substance of a portion of the sixth sentence of  
35 former Section 11523 of the Government Code.

##### 36 **§ 1123.940. Proceedings in forma pauperis**

37 1123.940. Notwithstanding any other provision of this article, if the petitioner  
38 has proceeded pursuant to Section 68511.3 of the Government Code and the  
39 Rules of Court implementing that section and if the transcript is necessary to a  
40 proper review of the administrative proceedings, the cost of preparing the  
41 transcript shall be borne by the agency.

1     **Comment.** Section 1123.940 continues the substance of the fourth sentence of subdivision  
2 (a) of former Section 1094.5 (proceedings in forma pauperis), and generalizes it to apply to  
3 all proceedings for judicial review of agency action.

4     **§ 1123.950. Attorney fees in action to review administrative proceeding**

5     1123.950. (a) If it is shown that an agency decision under state law was the  
6 result of arbitrary or capricious action or conduct by an agency or officer in an  
7 official capacity, the petitioner if the petitioner prevails on judicial review may  
8 collect reasonable attorney's fees, computed at one hundred dollars (\$100) per  
9 hour, but not to exceed seven thousand five hundred dollars (\$7,500), where the  
10 petitioner is personally obligated to pay the fees, from the agency, in addition to  
11 any other relief granted or other costs awarded.

12     (b) This section is ancillary only, and does not create a new cause of action.

13     (c) Refusal by an agency or officer to admit liability pursuant to a contract of  
14 insurance is not arbitrary or capricious action or conduct within the meaning of  
15 this section.

16     (d) This section does not apply to judicial review of actions of the State Board  
17 of Control or of a private hospital board.

18     **Comment.** Section 1123.950 continues former Government Code Section 800. See also  
19 Sections 1121.230 ("agency" defined), 1121.250 ("decision" defined).

1                               SELECTED CONFORMING REVISIONS

2   STATE BAR COURT

3   **Bus. & Prof. Code § 6089 (added). Inapplicability of Code of Civil Procedure**

4       6089. Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil  
5   Procedure does not apply to judicial review of proceedings of the State Bar  
6   Court.

7       **Comment.** Section 6089 makes clear the judicial review provisions in the Code of Civil  
8   Procedure do not apply to the State Bar Court.

9                               ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL APPEALS BOARD

10   **Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090 (amended). Jurisdiction**

11       23090. Any person affected by a final order of the board, including the  
12   department, may, ~~within the time limit specified in this section, apply to petition~~  
13   the Supreme Court or to the court of appeal for the appellate district in which the  
14   proceeding arose, for a writ of judicial review of such the final order. The  
15   application for writ of review ~~shall be made within 30 days after filing of the final~~  
16   order of the board.

17       **Comment.** Section 23090 is amended to change the application for a writ of review to a  
18   petition for judicial review, consistent with Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.610, and to  
19   delete the 30-day time limit formerly prescribed in this section. Under Code of Civil  
20   Procedure Section 1123.640, the petition for review must be filed not later than 30 days after  
21   the decision is effective. A decision is effective 30 days after it is delivered or mailed to the  
22   respondent, unless the agency orders that it shall become effective sooner. Gov't Code §  
23   11519.

24   **Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090.1 (repealed). Writ of review**

25       23090.1. ~~The writ of review shall be made returnable at a time and place then or~~  
26   ~~thereafter specified by court order and shall direct the board to certify the whole~~  
27   ~~record of the department in the case to the court within the time specified. No~~  
28   ~~new or additional evidence shall be introduced in such court, but the cause shall~~  
29   ~~be heard on the whole record of the department as certified to by the board.~~

30       **Comment.** Section 23090.1 is repealed because it is superseded by the judicial review  
31   provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure. See Section 23090.4. The provision in the first  
32   sentence for the return of the writ of review is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section  
33   1123.710 (applicability of rules of practice for civil actions). The provision in the first  
34   sentence for the record of the department is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section  
35   1123.820 (contents of administrative record). The second sentence is superseded by Code of  
36   Civil Procedure Sections 1123.810 (administrative record exclusive basis for judicial review)  
37   and 1123.850 (new evidence on judicial review).

**Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090.2 (repealed). Scope of review**

~~23090.2. The review by the court shall not extend further than to determine, based on the whole record of the department as certified by the board, whether:~~

- ~~(a) The department has proceeded without or in excess of its jurisdiction.~~
- ~~(b) The department has proceeded in the manner required by law.~~
- ~~(c) The decision of the department is supported by the findings.~~
- ~~(d) The findings in the department's decision are supported by substantial evidence in the light of the whole record.~~
- ~~(e) There is relevant evidence which, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have been produced at the hearing before the department.~~

~~Nothing in this article shall permit the court to hold a trial de novo, to take evidence, or to exercise its independent judgment on the evidence.~~

**Comment.** Subdivisions (a) through (d) of former Section 23090.2 are superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1123.410-1123.460 and 1123.160. Subdivision (e) is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.850. The last sentence is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1123.420 (interpretation or application of law), 1123.430 (fact-finding), 1123.810 (administrative record exclusive basis for judicial review), and 1123.850 (new evidence on judicial review). Nothing in the Code of Civil Procedure or in this article permits the court to hold a trial de novo.

**Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090.3 (amended). Right to appear in judicial review proceeding**

~~23090.3. The findings and conclusions of the department on questions of fact are conclusive and final and are not subject to review. Such questions of fact shall include ultimate facts and the findings and conclusions of the department. The parties to a judicial review proceeding are the board, the department, and each party to the action or proceeding before the board shall have the right to appear in the review proceeding. Following the hearing, the court shall enter judgment either affirming or reversing the decision of the department, or the court may remand the case for further proceedings before or reconsideration by the department whose interest is adverse to the person seeking judicial review.~~

**Comment.** Section 23090.3 is largely superseded by the judicial review provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure. See Section 23090.4. The first sentence is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.430 (review of agency fact-finding). The second sentence is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.420 (interpretation or application of law). The fourth sentence is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.730 (type of relief).

**Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090.4 (amended). Judicial review**

~~23090.4. The provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure relating to writs of review shall, insofar as applicable, apply to proceedings in the courts as provided by this article. A copy of every pleading filed pursuant to this article shall be served on the board, the department, and on each party who entered an appearance before the board. Judicial review shall be under Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure.~~

**Comment.** Section 23090.4 is amended to delete the first sentence, and to replace it with a reference to the judicial review provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure. Special provisions

of this article prevail over general provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure governing judicial review. See Bus. & Prof. Code § 1121.110 (conflicting or inconsistent statute controls). Copies of pleadings in judicial review proceedings must be served on the parties. See Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1123.610 (petition for review), 1123.710 (applicability of rules of practice for civil actions).

**Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090.5 (amended). Courts having jurisdiction**

23090.5. No court of this state, except the Supreme Court and the courts of appeal to the extent specified in this article, shall have jurisdiction to review, affirm, reverse, correct, or annul any order, rule, or decision of the department or to suspend, stay, or delay the operation or execution thereof, or to restrain, enjoin, or interfere with the department in the performance of its duties, ~~but a writ of mandate shall lie from the Supreme Court or the courts of appeal in any proper case.~~

**Comment.** Section 23090.5 is amended to delete the former reference to a writ of mandate. The writ of mandate has been replaced by a petition for review. See Section 23090.4; Code Civ. Proc. § 1123.610 (petition for review). *But cf.* Code Civ. Proc. § 1123.510(b) (original jurisdiction of Supreme Court or courts of appeal under California Constitution).

**Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090.6 (repealed). Stay of order**

~~23090.6. The filing of a petition for, or the pendency of, a writ of review shall not of itself stay or suspend the operation of any order, rule, or decision of the department, but the court before which the petition is filed may stay or suspend, in whole or in part, the operation of the order, rule, or decision of the department subject to review, upon the terms and conditions which it by order directs.~~

**Comment.** Former Section 23090.6 is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.720 (stays). See Section 23090.4.

**Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090.7 (amended). Effectiveness of order**

~~23097.7. No Except for the purpose of Section 1123.640 of the Code of Civil Procedure, no decision of the department which has been appealed to the board and no final order of the board shall become effective during the period in which application a petition for review may be made for a writ of review, as provided by Section 23090.~~

**Comment.** Section 23090.7 is amended to add the “except” clause. Section 23090.7 is also amended to recognize that judicial review under the Code of Civil Procedure has been substituted for a writ of review under this article. See Section 23090.4.

## TAXPAYER ACTIONS

**Code Civ. Proc. § 526a (amended). Taxpayer actions**

~~526a. An action to obtain a judgment, restraining and preventing any (a) A proceeding for judicial review of agency action to restrain or prevent illegal expenditure of, waste of, or injury to the estate, funds, or other property of a county, town, city or city and county of the state, may be maintained against any~~

1 officer thereof, or any agent, or other person, acting in its behalf, either by a  
2 citizen resident therein, or by a corporation, who is assessed for and is liable to  
3 pay, or, within one year before the commencement of the action, has paid, a tax  
4 therein. under Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3.

5 (b) This section does not affect any right of action in favor of a county, city,  
6 town, or city and county, or any public officer; provided that no injunction shall  
7 be granted restraining the offering for sale, sale, or issuance of any municipal  
8 bonds for public improvements or public utilities.

9 (c) ~~An action~~ A proceeding brought pursuant to this section to enjoin a public  
10 improvement project shall take special precedence over all civil matters on the  
11 calendar of the court except those matters to which equal precedence on the  
12 calendar is granted by law.

13 **Comment.** Section 526a is amended to conform to judicial review provisions. See Sections  
14 1120-1123.950. Under the judicial review provisions, the petitioner must show agency action  
15 is invalid on a ground specified in Sections 1123.410-1123.460. See Section 1123.160. The  
16 petition for review must name the agency as respondent or the agency head by title, not  
17 individual employees of the agency. Section 1123.610. Standing rules are provided in  
18 Sections 1123.210-1123.240.

## 19 VALIDATING PROCEEDINGS

### 20 **Code Civ. Proc. § 871 (added). Inapplicability of Title 2 of Part 3**

21 871. Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 does not apply to  
22 proceedings under this chapter.

23 **Comment.** Section 871 makes clear the judicial review provisions in Title 2 of Part 3 do not  
24 apply to proceedings under this chapter.

## 25 WRIT OF MANDATE

### 26 **Code Civ. Proc. § 1085 (amended). Writ of mandate**

27 1085. It ~~(a)~~ Subject to subdivision (b), a writ of mandate may be issued by any  
28 court, except a municipal ~~or justice~~ court, to any inferior tribunal, corporation,  
29 board, or person, to compel the performance of an act which the law specially  
30 enjoins, as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station; or to compel the  
31 admission of a party to the use and enjoyment of a right or office to which ~~he~~ the  
32 party is entitled, and from which ~~he~~ the party is unlawfully precluded by ~~such~~ the  
33 inferior tribunal, corporation, board or person.

34 (b) Judicial review of agency action to which Title 2 (commencing with Section  
35 1120) applies shall be under that title, and not under this chapter.

36 **Comment.** Section 1085 is amended to add subdivision (b) and to make other technical  
37 revisions. The former reference to a justice court is deleted, because justice courts have been  
38 abolished. See Cal. Const. art. VI, § 1.

**Code Civ. Proc. § 1085.5 (repealed). Action of Director of Food and Agriculture**

~~1085.5. Notwithstanding this chapter, in any action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul the activity of the Director of Food and Agriculture under Division 4 (commencing with Section 5001) or Division 5 (commencing with Section 9101) of the Food and Agricultural Code, the procedure for issuance of a writ of mandate shall be in accordance with Chapter 1.5 (commencing with Section 5051) of Part 1 of Division 4 of that code.~~

**Comment.** Section 1085.5 is repealed as obsolete, since Sections 5051-5064 of the Food and Agricultural Code have been repealed.

**Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5 (repealed). Administrative mandamus**

~~1094.5. (a) Where the writ is issued for the purpose of inquiring into the validity of any final administrative order or decision made as the result of a proceeding in which by law a hearing is required to be given, evidence is required to be taken, and discretion in the determination of facts is vested in the inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or officer, the case shall be heard by the court sitting without a jury. All or part of the record of the proceedings before the inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or officer may be filed with the petition, may be filed with respondent's points and authorities, or may be ordered to be filed by the court. Except when otherwise prescribed by statute, the cost of preparing the record shall be borne by the petitioner. Where the petitioner has proceeded pursuant to Section 68511.3 of the Government Code and the Rules of Court implementing that section and where the transcript is necessary to a proper review of the administrative proceedings, the cost of preparing the transcript shall be borne by the respondent. Where the party seeking the writ has proceeded pursuant to Section 1088.5, the administrative record shall be filed as expeditiously as possible, and may be filed with the petition, or by the respondent after payment of the costs by the petitioner, where required, or as otherwise directed by the court. If the expense of preparing all or any part of the record has been borne by the prevailing party, the expense shall be taxable as costs.~~

~~(b) The inquiry in such a case shall extend to the questions whether the respondent has proceeded without, or in excess of jurisdiction; whether there was a fair trial; and whether there was any prejudicial abuse of discretion. Abuse of discretion is established if the respondent has not proceeded in the manner required by law, the order or decision is not supported by the findings, or the findings are not supported by the evidence.~~

~~(c) Where it is claimed that the findings are not supported by the evidence, in cases in which the court is authorized by law to exercise its independent judgment on the evidence, abuse of discretion is established if the court determines that the findings are not supported by the weight of the evidence. In all other cases, abuse of discretion is established if the court determines that the findings are not supported by substantial evidence in the light of the whole record.~~

1     ~~(d) Notwithstanding subdivision (c), in cases arising from private hospital~~  
2     ~~boards or boards of directors of districts organized pursuant to The Local~~  
3     ~~Hospital District Law, Division 23 (commencing with Section 32000) of the~~  
4     ~~Health and Safety Code or governing bodies of municipal hospitals formed~~  
5     ~~pursuant to Article 7 (commencing with Section 37600) or Article 8 (commencing~~  
6     ~~with Section 37650) of Chapter 5 of Division 3 of Title 4 of the Government~~  
7     ~~Code, abuse of discretion is established if the court determines that the findings~~  
8     ~~are not supported by substantial evidence in the light of the whole record.~~  
9     ~~However, in all cases in which the petition alleges discriminatory actions~~  
10    ~~prohibited by Section 1316 of the Health and Safety Code, and the plaintiff~~  
11    ~~makes a preliminary showing of substantial evidence in support of that allegation,~~  
12    ~~the court shall exercise its independent judgment on the evidence and abuse of~~  
13    ~~discretion shall be established if the court determines that the findings are not~~  
14    ~~supported by the weight of the evidence.~~

15    ~~(e) Where the court finds that there is relevant evidence which, in the exercise~~  
16    ~~of reasonable diligence, could not have been produced or which was improperly~~  
17    ~~excluded at the hearing before respondent, it may enter judgment as provided in~~  
18    ~~subdivision (f) remanding the case to be reconsidered in the light of that~~  
19    ~~evidence; or, in cases in which the court is authorized by law to exercise its~~  
20    ~~independent judgment on the evidence, the court may admit the evidence at the~~  
21    ~~hearing on the writ without remanding the case.~~

22    ~~(f) The court shall enter judgment either commanding respondent to set aside~~  
23    ~~the order or decision, or denying the writ. Where the judgment commands that~~  
24    ~~the order or decision be set aside, it may order the reconsideration of the case in~~  
25    ~~the light of the court's opinion and judgment and may order respondent to take~~  
26    ~~such further action as is specially enjoined upon it by law, but the judgment shall~~  
27    ~~not limit or control in any way the discretion legally vested in the respondent.~~

28    ~~(g) Except as provided in subdivision (h), the court in which proceedings under~~  
29    ~~this section are instituted may stay the operation of the administrative order or~~  
30    ~~decision pending the judgment of the court, or until the filing of a notice of~~  
31    ~~appeal from the judgment or until the expiration of the time for filing the notice,~~  
32    ~~whichever occurs first. However, no such stay shall be imposed or continued if~~  
33    ~~the court is satisfied that it is against the public interest; provided that the~~  
34    ~~application for the stay shall be accompanied by proof of service of a copy of the~~  
35    ~~application on the respondent. Service shall be made in the manner provided by~~  
36    ~~Title 5 (commencing with Section 405) of Part 2 or Chapter 5 (commencing with~~  
37    ~~Section 1010) of Title 14 of Part 2. If an appeal is taken from a denial of the writ,~~  
38    ~~the order or decision of the agency shall not be stayed except upon the order of~~  
39    ~~the court to which the appeal is taken. However, in cases where a stay is in effect~~  
40    ~~at the time of filing the notice of appeal, the stay shall be continued by operation~~  
41    ~~of law for a period of 20 days from the filing of the notice. If an appeal is taken~~  
42    ~~from the granting of the writ, the order or decision of the agency is stayed~~  
43    ~~pending the determination of the appeal unless the court to which the appeal is~~

1 taken shall otherwise order. Where any final administrative order or decision is  
2 the subject of proceedings under this section, if the petition shall have been filed  
3 while the penalty imposed is in full force and effect, the determination shall not be  
4 considered to have become moot in cases where the penalty imposed by the  
5 administrative agency has been completed or complied with during the pendency  
6 of the proceedings.

7 (h) (1) The court in which proceedings under this section are instituted may stay  
8 the operation of the administrative order or decision of any licensed hospital or  
9 any state agency made after a hearing required by statute to be conducted under  
10 the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, as set forth in Chapter 5  
11 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the  
12 Government Code, conducted by the agency itself or an administrative law judge  
13 on the staff of the Office of Administrative Hearings pending the judgment of the  
14 court, or until the filing of a notice of appeal from the judgment or until the  
15 expiration of the time for filing the notice, whichever occurs first. However, the  
16 stay shall not be imposed or continued unless the court is satisfied that the public  
17 interest will not suffer and that the licensed hospital or agency is unlikely to  
18 prevail ultimately on the merits; and provided further that the application for the  
19 stay shall be accompanied by proof of service of a copy of the application on the  
20 respondent. Service shall be made in the manner provided by Title 5 (commencing  
21 with Section 405) of Part 2 or Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 1010) of Title  
22 14 of Part 2.

23 (2) The standard set forth in this subdivision for obtaining a stay shall apply to  
24 any administrative order or decision of an agency which issues licenses pursuant  
25 to Division 2 (commencing with Section 500) of the Business and Professions  
26 Code or pursuant to the Osteopathic Initiative Act or the Chiropractic Initiative  
27 Act. With respect to orders or decisions of other state agencies, the standard in  
28 this subdivision shall apply only when the agency has adopted the proposed  
29 decision of the administrative law judge in its entirety or has adopted the  
30 proposed decision but reduced the proposed penalty pursuant to subdivision (b)  
31 of Section 11517 of the Government Code; otherwise the standard in subdivision  
32 (g) shall apply.

33 (3) If an appeal is taken from a denial of the writ, the order or decision of the  
34 hospital or agency shall not be stayed except upon the order of the court to  
35 which the appeal is taken. However, in cases where a stay is in effect at the time  
36 of filing the notice of appeal, the stay shall be continued by operation of law for a  
37 period of 20 days from the filing of the notice. If an appeal is taken from the  
38 granting of the writ, the order or decision of the hospital or agency is stayed  
39 pending the determination of the appeal unless the court to which the appeal is  
40 taken shall otherwise order. Where any final administrative order or decision is  
41 the subject of proceedings under this section, if the petition shall have been filed  
42 while the penalty imposed is in full force and effect, the determination shall not be  
43 considered to have become moot in cases where the penalty imposed by the

administrative agency has been completed or complied with during the pendency of the proceedings.

(i) Any administrative record received for filing by the clerk of the court may be disposed of as provided in Sections 1952, 1952.2, and 1952.3.

(j) Effective January 1, 1996, this subdivision shall apply only to state employees in State Bargaining Unit 5. For purposes of this section, the court is not authorized to review any disciplinary decisions reached pursuant to Section 19576.1 of the Government Code.

**Comment.** The portion of the first sentence of subdivision (a) of former Section 1094.5 relating to finality is superseded by Section 1123.120 (finality). The portion of the first sentence of former subdivision (a) relating to trial by jury is superseded by Section 1123.740. The second sentence of former subdivision (a) is superseded by Section 1123.710(a) (Judicial Council rules of pleading and practice). See also Sections 1123.830(c) (delivery of record) and 1123.840 (disposal of record). The third sentence of former subdivision (a) is superseded by Section 1123.910 (fee for preparing record). The fourth sentence of former subdivision (a) is continued in substance in Section 1123.940 (proceedings in forma pauperis). The fifth sentence of former subdivision (a) is superseded by Section 1123.710(a) (Judicial Council rules of pleading and practice). The sixth sentence of former subdivision (a) is superseded by Section 1123.920 (recovery of costs of suit).

The provision of subdivision (b) relating to review of whether the respondent has proceeded without or in excess of jurisdiction is superseded by Section 1123.420 (review of agency interpretation or application of law). The provision relating to whether there has been a fair trial is superseded by Section 1123.460 (review of agency procedure). The provision relating to whether there has been a prejudicial abuse of discretion is superseded by Section 1123.450 (review of agency exercise of discretion). The provision relating to proceeding in the manner required by law is superseded by Section 1123.460 (review of agency procedure). The provision relating to an order or decision not supported by findings or findings not supported by evidence is superseded by Section 1123.430 (review of agency fact finding).

Subdivision (c) is superseded by Section 1123.430 (review of agency fact finding).

Subdivision (d) is superseded by Health and Safety Code Sections 1339.62-1339.64.


Subdivision (e) is superseded by Section 1123.850 (new evidence on judicial review).

The first sentence and first portion of the second sentence of subdivision (f) is continued in Section 1123.730(c) (type of relief). The last portion of the second sentence of subdivision (f) is continued in substance in Section 1121.140 (exercise of agency discretion).

The first through sixth sentences of subdivision (g), and the first, second, and third sentences of subdivision (h)(3), are superseded by Section 1123.720 (stay). The seventh sentence of subdivision (g) and the fourth sentence of subdivision (h)(3) are continued in Section 1123.150 (proceeding not moot because penalty completed).

Subdivision (i) is continued without change in Section 1123.840 (disposal of administrative record).

Subdivision (j) is continued in Section 19576.1 of the Government Code. See also Code Civ. Proc. § 1120 (judicial review title does not apply to decision under Government Code Section 19576.1).

 **Note.** Conforming revisions to the many statutes that refer to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5 are set out in a separate document.

#### **Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6 (repealed). Review of local agency decision**

~~1094.6. (a) Judicial review of any decision of a local agency, other than school district, as the term local agency is defined in Section 54951 of the Government~~

1 Code, or of any commission, board, officer or agent thereof, may be had pursuant  
2 to Section 1094.5 of this code only if the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to  
3 such section is filed within the time limits specified in this section.

4 (b) Any such petition shall be filed not later than the 90th day following the  
5 date on which the decision becomes final. If there is no provision for  
6 reconsideration of the decision, or for a written decision or written findings  
7 supporting the decision, in any applicable provision of any statute, charter, or rule,  
8 for the purposes of this section, the decision is final on the date it is announced. If  
9 the decision is not announced at the close of the hearing, the date, time, and place  
10 of the announcement of the decision shall be announced at the hearing. If there is  
11 a provision for reconsideration, the decision is final for purposes of this section  
12 upon the expiration of the period during which such reconsideration can be  
13 sought; provided, that if reconsideration is sought pursuant to any such provision  
14 the decision is final for the purposes of this section on the date that  
15 reconsideration is rejected. If there is a provision for a written decision or written  
16 findings, the decision is final for purposes of this section upon the date it is mailed  
17 by first-class mail, postage prepaid, including a copy of the affidavit or certificate  
18 of mailing, to the party seeking the writ. Subdivision (a) of Section 1013 does not  
19 apply to extend the time, following deposit in the mail of the decision or findings,  
20 within which a petition shall be filed.

21 (c) The complete record of the proceedings shall be prepared by the local  
22 agency or its commission, board, officer, or agent which made the decision and  
23 shall be delivered to the petitioner within 190 days after he has filed a written  
24 request therefor. The local agency may recover from the petitioner its actual costs  
25 for transcribing or otherwise preparing the record. Such record shall include the  
26 transcript of the proceedings, all pleadings, all notices and orders, any proposed  
27 decision by a hearing officer, the final decision, all admitted exhibits, all rejected  
28 exhibits in the possession of the local agency or its commission, board, officer, or  
29 agent, all written evidence, and any other papers in the case.

30 (d) If the petitioner files a request for the record as specified in subdivision (c)  
31 within 10 days after the date the decision becomes final as provided in  
32 subdivision (b), the time within which a petition pursuant to Section 1094.5 may  
33 be filed shall be extended to not later than the 30th day following the date on  
34 which the record is either personally delivered or mailed to the petitioner or his  
35 attorney of record, if he has one.

36 (e) As used in this section, decision means a decision subject to review pursuant  
37 to Section 1094.5, suspending, demoting, or dismissing an officer or employee,  
38 revoking, or denying an application for a permit, license, or other entitlement, or  
39 denying an application for any retirement benefit or allowance.

40 (f) In making a final decision as defined in subdivision (e), the local agency shall  
41 provide notice to the party that the time within which judicial review must be  
42 sought is governed by this section.

As used in this subdivision, “party” means an officer or employee who has been suspended, demoted or dismissed; a person whose permit, license, or other entitlement has been revoked or suspended, or whose application for a permit, license, or other entitlement has been denied; or a person whose application for a retirement benefit or allowance has been denied.

(g) This section shall prevail over any conflicting provision in any otherwise applicable law relating to the subject matter, unless the conflicting provision is a state or federal law which provides a shorter statute of limitations, in which case the shorter statute of limitations shall apply.

**Comment.** Subdivision (a) and the first sentence of subdivision (b) of former Section 1094.6 is superseded by Sections 1121.230 (“agency” defined), 1121.260 (“local agency” defined), 1123.650 (time for filing petition for review), 1123.120 (finality), and 1123.140 (exception to finality requirement). The second, fourth, and fifth sentences of subdivision (b) are superseded by Section 1123.120. The third sentence of subdivision (b) is continued in Government Code Section 54962(b).

The first sentence of subdivision (c) is superseded by Section 1123.830 (preparation of the record). The second sentence of subdivision (c) is superseded by Section 1123.910 (fee for preparing record). The third sentence of subdivision (c) is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.820 (contents of administrative record).

Subdivision (d) is superseded by Section 1123.650 (time for filing petition for review). Under Section 1123.650, the time for filing the petition for review is not dependent on receipt of the record, which normally will take place after the petition is filed.

Subdivision (e) is superseded by Section 1121.250 (“decision” defined). See also Gov’t Code § 54962(a).

Subdivision (f) is continued in Sections 1123.650 (time for filing petition for review of decision in adjudicative proceeding) and 1121.270 (“party” defined). Subdivision (g) is not continued.

## COMMISSION ON PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

### **Educ. Code § 44945 (amended). Judicial review**

44945. The decision of the Commission on Professional Competence may, on petition of either the governing board or the employee, be reviewed by a court of competent jurisdiction in the same manner as a decision made by a hearing officer under Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code. The court, on review, shall exercise its independent judgment on the evidence under Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure. The proceeding shall be set for hearing at the earliest possible date and shall take precedence over all other cases, except older matters of the same character and matters to which special precedence is given by law.

**Comment.** Section 44945 is amended to make judicial review under this section subject to the provisions for judicial review in the Code of Civil Procedure. The former second sentence of Section 44945 is superseded by the standards of review in Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1123.410-1123.460.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY  
COLLEGES

**Educ. Code § 87682 (amended). Judicial review**

87682. The decision of the arbitrator or administrative law judge, as the case may be, may, on petition of either the governing board or the employee, be reviewed by a court of competent jurisdiction ~~in the same manner as a decision made by an administrative law judge under Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code. The court, on review, shall exercise its independent judgment on the evidence. under Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure.~~ The proceeding shall be set for hearing at the earliest possible date and shall take precedence over all other cases, except older matters of the same character and matters to which special precedence is given by law.

**Comment.** Section 87682 is amended to make judicial review under this section subject to the provisions for judicial review in the Code of Civil Procedure. The former second sentence of Section 87682 is superseded by the standards of review in Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1123.410-1123.460.

COSTS IN CIVIL ACTIONS RESULTING FROM ADMINISTRATIVE  
PROCEEDINGS


**Gov't Code § 800 (repealed). Costs in action to review administrative proceeding**

800. ~~In any civil action to appeal or review the award, finding, or other determination of any administrative proceeding under this code or under any other provision of state law, except actions resulting from actions of the State Board of Control, where it is shown that the award, finding, or other determination of the proceeding was the result of arbitrary or capricious action or conduct by a public entity or an officer thereof in his or her official capacity, the complainant if he or she prevails in the civil action may collect reasonable attorney's fees, computed at one hundred dollars (\$100) per hour, but not to exceed seven thousand five hundred dollars (\$7,500), where he or she is personally obligated to pay the fees, from the public entity, in addition to any other relief granted or other costs awarded.~~

~~This section is ancillary only, and shall not be construed to create a new cause of action.~~

~~Refusal by a public entity or officer thereof to admit liability pursuant to a contract of insurance shall not be considered arbitrary or capricious action or conduct within the meaning of this section.~~

**Comment.** Former Section 800 is continued in Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.950.

 **Note.** Conforming revisions to the statutes that refer to Government Code Section 800 are set out in a separate document.

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD

**Gov't Code § 3520 (amended). Judicial review of unit determination or unfair practice case**

3520. (a) Judicial review of a unit determination shall only be allowed: (1) when the board, in response to a petition from the state or an employee organization, agrees that the case is one of special importance and joins in the request for such review; or (2) when the issue is raised as a defense to an unfair practice complaint. A board order directing an election shall not be stayed pending judicial review.

Upon receipt of a board order joining in the request for judicial review, a party to the case may petition for ~~a writ of extraordinary relief from~~ review of the unit determination decision or order.

(b) Any charging party, respondent, or intervenor aggrieved by a final decision or order of the board in an unfair practice case, except a decision of the board not to issue a complaint in such a case, may petition for ~~a writ of extraordinary relief from such~~ review of the decision or order.

(c) ~~Such~~ The petition shall be filed in the district court of appeal in the appellate district where the unit determination or unfair practice dispute occurred. ~~The petition shall be filed within 30 days after issuance of the board's final order, order denying reconsideration, or order joining in the request for judicial review, as applicable.~~ Upon the filing of ~~such~~ the petition, the court shall cause notice to be served upon the board and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding. The board shall file in the court the record of the proceeding, certified by the board, within 10 days after the clerk's notice unless ~~such~~ the time is extended by the court for good cause shown. The court shall have jurisdiction to grant to the board ~~such~~ any temporary relief or restraining order it deems just and proper and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, or setting aside the order of the board. ~~The findings of the board with respect to questions of fact, including ultimate facts, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive. The provisions of Title 1 (commencing with Section 1067) Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure relating to writs shall, except where specifically superseded herein, apply to proceedings pursuant to this section.~~

(d) If the time to petition for ~~extraordinary relief from~~ judicial review of a board decision has expired, the board may seek enforcement of any final decision or order in a district court of appeal or a superior court in the appellate district where the unit determination or unfair practice case occurred. If, after hearing, the court determines that the order was issued pursuant to procedures established by the board and that the person or entity refuses to comply with the order, the court shall enforce ~~such~~ the order by writ of mandamus appropriate process. The court shall not review the merits of the order.

**Comment.** Section 3520 is amended to make judicial review of the Public Employment Relations Board subject to the provisions for judicial review in the Code of Civil Procedure, except as provided in this section. The board is exempt from the provision in the Code of

1 Civil Procedure governing standard of review of questions of application of law to facts and  
2 of pure questions of law, so existing case law will continue to apply to the board. See Code  
3 Civ. Proc. § 1123.420(c) & Comment.

4 The former second sentence of subdivision (c) which required the petition to be filed within  
5 30 days after issuance of the board's final order, order denying reconsideration, or order  
6 joining in the request for judicial review, is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section  
7 1123.640. Under that section, the petition for review must be filed not later than 30 days after  
8 the decision is effective. A decision is effective 30 days after it is delivered or mailed to the  
9 respondent, unless the agency orders that it shall become effective sooner. Gov't Code §  
10 11519.

11 **Gov't Code § 3542 (amended). Review of unit determination**

12 3542. (a) No employer or employee organization shall have the right to judicial  
13 review of a unit determination except: (1) when the board in response to a  
14 petition from an employer or employee organization, agrees that the case is one of  
15 special importance and joins in the request for such review; or (2) when the issue  
16 is raised as a defense to an unfair practice complaint. A board order directing an  
17 election shall not be stayed pending judicial review.

18 Upon receipt of a board order joining in the request for judicial review, a party  
19 to the case may petition for ~~a writ of extraordinary relief from judicial review of~~  
20 the unit determination decision or order.

21 (b) Any charging party, respondent, or intervenor aggrieved by a final decision  
22 or order of the board in an unfair practice case, except a decision of the board not  
23 to issue a complaint in such a case, may petition for ~~a writ of extraordinary relief~~  
24 ~~from such judicial review of the decision or order.~~

25 (c) ~~Such~~ The petition shall be filed in the district court of appeal in the appellate  
26 district where the unit determination or unfair practice dispute occurred. ~~The~~  
27 ~~petition shall be filed within 30 days after issuance of the board's final order,~~  
28 ~~order denying reconsideration, or order joining in the request for judicial review,~~  
29 ~~as applicable.~~ Upon the filing of ~~such~~ the petition, the court shall cause notice to  
30 be served upon the board and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the  
31 proceeding. The board shall file in the court the record of the proceeding, certified  
32 by the board, within 10 days after the clerk's notice unless ~~such~~ the time is  
33 extended by the court for good cause shown. The court shall have jurisdiction to  
34 grant to the board ~~such~~ any temporary relief or restraining order it deems just and  
35 proper and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, or  
36 setting aside the order of the board. ~~The findings of the board with respect to~~  
37 ~~questions of fact, including ultimate facts, if supported by substantial evidence on~~  
38 ~~the record considered as a whole, are conclusive.~~ The provisions of Title ~~1~~  
39 ~~(commencing with Section 1067)~~ Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part  
40 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure ~~relating to writs shall, except where specifically~~  
41 ~~superseded herein, apply to proceedings pursuant to this section.~~

42 (d) If the time to petition for ~~extraordinary relief from judicial review~~ of a board  
43 decision has expired, the board may seek enforcement of any final decision or  
44 order in a ~~district~~ court of appeal or a superior court in the appellate district where

1 the unit determination or unfair practice case occurred. The board shall respond  
2 within 10 days to any inquiry from a party to the action as to why the board has  
3 not sought court enforcement of the final decision or order. If the response does  
4 not indicate that there has been compliance with the board's final decision or  
5 order, the board shall seek enforcement of the final decision or order upon the  
6 request of the party. The board shall file in the court the record of the proceeding,  
7 certified by the board, and appropriate evidence disclosing the failure to comply  
8 with the decision or order. If, after hearing, the court determines that the order  
9 was issued pursuant to procedures established by the board and that the person  
10 or entity refuses to comply with the order, the court shall enforce such the order  
11 ~~by writ of mandamus~~ appropriate process. The court shall not review the merits of  
12 the order.

13 **Comment.** Section 3542 is amended to make judicial review of the Public Employment  
14 Relations Board subject to the provisions for judicial review in the Code of Civil Procedure,  
15 except as provided in this section. Special provisions of this section prevail over general  
16 provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure governing judicial review. See Code of Civil  
17 Procedure Section 1121.110 (conflicting or inconsistent statute controls). The board is  
18 exempt from the provision in the Code of Civil Procedure governing standard of review of  
19 questions of application of law to facts and of pure questions of law, so existing case law will  
20 continue to apply to the board. See Code Civ. Proc. § 1123.420(c) & Comment.

21 The former second sentence of subdivision (c) which required the petition to be filed within  
22 30 days after issuance of the board's final order, order denying reconsideration, or order  
23 joining in the request for judicial review, is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section  
24 1123.640. Under that section, the petition for review must be filed not later than 30 days after  
25 the decision is effective. A decision is effective 30 days after it is delivered or mailed to the  
26 respondent, unless the agency orders that it shall become effective sooner. Gov't Code §  
27 11519.

28 **Gov't Code § 3564 (amended). Judicial review of unit determination or unfair practice**  
29 **case**

30 3564. (a) No employer or employee organization shall have the right to judicial  
31 review of a unit determination except: (1) when the board in response to a  
32 petition from an employer or employee organization, agrees that the case is one of  
33 special importance and joins in the request for such review; or (2) when the issue  
34 is raised as a defense to an unfair practice complaint. A board order directing an  
35 election shall not be stayed pending judicial review.

36 Upon receipt of a board order joining in the request for judicial review, a party  
37 to the case may petition for ~~a writ of extraordinary relief from judicial review of~~  
38 ~~the unit determination decision or order.~~

39 (b) Any charging party, respondent, or intervenor aggrieved by a final decision  
40 or order of the board in an unfair practice case, except a decision of the board not  
41 to issue a complaint in such a case, may petition for ~~a writ of extraordinary relief~~  
42 ~~from such judicial review of the decision or order.~~

43 (c) Such The petition shall be filed in the district court of appeal in the appellate  
44 district where the unit determination or unfair practice dispute occurred. The  
45 petition shall be filed within 30 days after issuance of the board's final order,

1 ~~order denying reconsideration, or order joining in the request for judicial review,~~  
2 ~~as applicable.~~ Upon the filing of such the petition, the court shall cause notice to  
3 be served upon the board and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the  
4 proceeding. The board shall file in the court the record of the proceeding, certified  
5 by the board, within 10 days after the clerk's notice unless ~~such~~ the time is  
6 extended by the court for good cause shown. The court shall have jurisdiction to  
7 grant to the board ~~such~~ any temporary relief or restraining order it deems just and  
8 proper and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, or  
9 setting aside the order of the board. ~~The findings of the board with respect to~~  
10 ~~questions of fact, including ultimate facts, if supported by substantial evidence on~~  
11 ~~the record considered as a whole, are conclusive.~~ The provisions of Title ~~1~~  
12 ~~(commencing with Section 1067)~~ Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part  
13 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure ~~relating to writs~~ shall, except where specifically  
14 superseded herein, apply to proceedings pursuant to this section.

15 (d) If the time to petition for ~~extraordinary relief from~~ judicial review of a board  
16 decision has expired, the board may seek enforcement of any final decision or  
17 order in a ~~district~~ court of appeal or a superior court in the appellate district where  
18 the unit determination or unfair practice case occurred. If, after hearing, the court  
19 determines that the order was issued pursuant to procedures established by the  
20 board and that the person or entity refuses to comply with the order, the court  
21 shall enforce ~~such the order by writ of mandamus~~ appropriate process. The court  
22 shall not review the merits of the order.

23 **Comment.** Section 3564 is amended to make judicial review of the Public Employment  
24 Relations Board subject to the provisions for judicial review in the Code of Civil Procedure.  
25 The board is exempt from the provision in the Code of Civil Procedure governing standard of  
26 review of questions of application of law to facts and of pure questions of law, so existing case  
27 law will continue to apply to the board. See Code Civ. Proc. § 1123.420(c) & Comment.

28 The former second sentence of subdivision (c) which required the petition to be filed within  
29 30 days after issuance of the board's final order, order denying reconsideration, or order  
30 joining in the request for judicial review, is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section  
31 1123.640. Under that section, the petition for review must be filed not later than 30 days after  
32 the decision is effective. A decision is effective 30 days after it is delivered or mailed to the  
33 respondent, unless the agency orders that it shall become effective sooner. Gov't Code §  
34 11519.

## 35 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT — RULEMAKING

### 36 Gov't Code § 11350 (amended). Judicial declaration on validity of regulation

37 11350. (a) ~~Any interested A~~ person may obtain a judicial declaration as to the  
38 validity of any regulation ~~by bringing an action for declaratory relief in the~~  
39 ~~superior court in accordance with~~ under Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120)  
40 of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure. ~~The right to a judicial determination shall~~  
41 ~~not be affected either by the failure to petition or to seek reconsideration of a~~  
42 ~~petition filed pursuant to Section 11347.1 before the agency promulgating the~~  
43 ~~regulations.~~ The regulation may be declared to be invalid for a substantial failure

1 to comply with this chapter, or, in the case of an emergency regulation or order to  
2 repeal, upon the ground that the facts recited in the statement do not constitute  
3 an emergency within the provisions of Section 11346.1.

4 (b) In addition to any other ground that may exist, a regulation may be declared  
5 invalid if either of the following exists:

6 (1) The agency's determination that the regulation is reasonably necessary to  
7 effectuate the purpose of the statute, court decision, or other provision of law that  
8 is being implemented, interpreted, or made specific by the regulation is not  
9 supported by substantial evidence.

10 (2) The agency declaration pursuant to paragraph (8) of subdivision (a) of  
11 Section 11346.5 is in conflict with substantial evidence in the record.

12 ~~For purposes of this section, the record shall be deemed to consist of all material~~  
13 ~~maintained in the file of the rulemaking proceeding as defined in Section 11347.3.~~

14 (c) The approval of a regulation by the office or the Governor's overruling of a  
15 decision of the office disapproving a regulation shall not be considered by a court  
16 in any action for declaratory relief brought with respect to a proceeding for  
17 judicial review of a regulation.

18 **Comment.** Section 11350 is amended to recognize that judicial review of agency  
19 regulations is now accomplished under Title 2 of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure. The  
20 former second sentence of subdivision (a) is continued in Code of Civil Procedure Section  
21 1123.330 (judicial review of rulemaking). The former second sentence of subdivision (b)(2)  
22 is continued in Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.820(b) (contents of administrative  
23 record).

## 24 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT — ADJUDICATION

### 25 Gov't Code § 11420.10 (amended). ADR authorized

26 11420.10. (a) An agency, with the consent of all the parties, may refer a dispute  
27 that is the subject of an adjudicative proceeding for resolution by any of the  
28 following means:

29 (1) Mediation by a neutral mediator.

30 (2) Binding arbitration by a neutral arbitrator. An award in a binding arbitration  
31 is subject to judicial review in the manner provided in Chapter 4 (commencing  
32 with Section 1285) of Title 9 of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Title 2  
33 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure does  
34 not apply to judicial review of an award in binding arbitration under this section.

35 (3) Nonbinding arbitration by a neutral arbitrator. The arbitrator's decision in a  
36 nonbinding arbitration is final unless within 30 days after the arbitrator delivers  
37 the award to the agency head a party requests that the agency conduct a de  
38 novo adjudicative proceeding. If the decision in the de novo proceeding is not  
39 more favorable to the party electing the de novo proceeding, the party shall pay  
40 the costs and fees specified in Section 1141.21 of the Code of Civil Procedure  
41 insofar as applicable in the adjudicative proceeding.

1 (b) If another statute requires mediation or arbitration in an adjudicative  
2 proceeding, that statute prevails over this section.

3 (c) This section does not apply in an adjudicative proceeding to the extent an  
4 agency by regulation provides that this section is not applicable in a proceeding  
5 of the agency.

6 **Comment.** Section 11420.10 is amended to make clear the judicial review provisions of the  
7 Code of Civil Procedure do not apply to binding arbitration under this section.

8 **Gov't Code § 11523 (repealed). Judicial review**

9 ~~11523. Judicial review may be had by filing a petition for a writ of mandate in  
10 accordance with the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure, subject, however,  
11 to the statutes relating to the particular agency. Except as otherwise provided in  
12 this section, the petition shall be filed within 30 days after the last day on which  
13 reconsideration can be ordered. The right to petition shall not be affected by the  
14 failure to seek reconsideration before the agency. On request of the petitioner for  
15 a record of the proceedings, the complete record of the proceedings, or the parts  
16 thereof as are designated by the petitioner in the request, shall be prepared by the  
17 Office of Administrative Hearings or the agency and shall be delivered to  
18 petitioner, within 30 days after the request, which time shall be extended for good  
19 cause shown, upon the payment of the fee specified in Section 69950 for the  
20 transcript, the cost of preparation of other portions of the record and for  
21 certification thereof. Thereafter, the remaining balance of any costs or charges for  
22 the preparation of the record shall be assessed against the petitioner whenever  
23 the agency prevails on judicial review following trial of the cause. These costs or  
24 charges constitute a debt of the petitioner which is collectible by the agency in  
25 the same manner as in the case of an obligation under a contract, and no license  
26 shall be renewed or reinstated where the petitioner has failed to pay all of these  
27 costs or charges. The complete record includes the pleadings, all notices and  
28 orders issued by the agency, any proposed decision by an administrative law  
29 judge, the final decision, a transcript of all proceedings, the exhibits admitted or  
30 rejected, the written evidence and any other papers in the case. Where petitioner,  
31 within 10 days after the last day on which reconsideration can be ordered,  
32 requests the agency to prepare all or any part of the record the time within which  
33 a petition may be filed shall be extended until 30 days after its delivery to him or  
34 her. The agency may file with the court the original of any document in the  
35 record in lieu of a copy thereof. In the event that the petitioner prevails in  
36 overturning the administrative decision following judicial review, the agency shall  
37 reimburse the petitioner for all costs of transcript preparation, compilation of the  
38 record, and certification.~~

39 **Comment.** The first sentence of former Section 11523, as amended by 1995 Cal. Stat. ch.  
40 938, is continued in Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1120 (application of title) and  
41 1121.110 (conflicting or inconsistent statute controls).

42 The second sentence is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.640 (time for  
43 filing petition for review of decision in adjudicative proceeding).

1 The third sentence is restated in Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.320 (administrative  
2 review of final decision).

3 The first portion of the fourth sentence is continued in Code of Civil Procedure Section  
4 1123.830 (preparation of record). The last portion of the fourth sentence is continued in  
5 substance in Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.910 (fee for preparing record).

6 The fifth sentence is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.920 (recovery of  
7 costs of suit).

8 The first portion of the sixth sentence is omitted as unnecessary, since under Section  
9 1123.920(b) the cost of the record is recoverable by the prevailing party, and under general  
10 rules of civil procedure costs of suit are included in the judgment. See Code Civ. Proc. §  
11 1034(a); Cal. Ct. R. 870(b)(4). The last portion of the sixth sentence is continued in Code of  
12 Civil Procedure Section 1123.930.

13 The seventh sentence is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.820 (contents  
14 of administrative record).

15 The eighth sentence is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.640 (time for  
16 filing petition for review of decision in adjudicative proceeding).

17 The ninth sentence is continued in substance in Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.710  
18 (applicability of rules of practice for civil actions) and Evidence Code Section 1511  
19 (duplicate and original of a writing generally admissible to same extent).

20 The tenth sentence is continued in substance in Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.920.

#### 21 **Gov't Code § 11524 (amended). Continuances**

22 11524. (a) The agency may grant continuances. When an administrative law  
23 judge of the Office of Administrative Hearings has been assigned to the hearing,  
24 no continuance may be granted except by him or her or by the presiding judge of  
25 the appropriate regional office of the Office of Administrative Hearings, for good  
26 cause shown.

27 (b) When seeking a continuance, a party shall apply for the continuance within  
28 10 working days following the time the party discovered or reasonably should  
29 have discovered the event or occurrence which establishes the good cause for  
30 the continuance. A continuance may be granted for good cause after the 10  
31 working days have lapsed if the party seeking the continuance is not responsible  
32 for and has made a good faith effort to prevent the condition or event  
33 establishing the good cause.

34 ~~(c) In the event that an application for a continuance by a party is denied by an~~  
35 ~~administrative law judge of the Office of Administrative Hearings, and the party~~  
36 ~~seeks judicial review thereof, the party shall, within 10 working days of the denial,~~  
37 ~~make application for appropriate judicial relief in the superior court or be barred~~  
38 ~~from judicial review thereof as a matter of jurisdiction. A party applying for~~  
39 ~~judicial relief from the denial shall give notice to the agency and other parties.~~  
40 ~~Notwithstanding Section 1010 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the notice may be~~  
41 ~~either oral at the time of the denial of application for a continuance or written at~~  
42 ~~the same time application is made in court for judicial relief. This subdivision does~~  
43 ~~not apply to the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control.~~

44 **Comment.** Section 11524 is amended to delete the provision for immediate review of  
45 denial of a continuance. Standard principles of finality and exhaustion of administrative

remedies apply to this and other preliminary decisions in adjudicative proceeding. See, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 1123.310 (exhaustion required).

STATE PERSONNEL BOARD AND DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL  
ADMINISTRATION

**Gov't Code § 19576.1 (amended). Employee discipline in State Bargaining Unit 5**

19576.1. (a) Effective January 1, 1996, notwithstanding Section 19576, this section shall apply only to state employees in State Bargaining Unit 5.

(b) Whenever an answer is filed by an employee who has been suspended without pay for five days or less or who has received a formal reprimand or up to a five percent reduction in pay for five months or less, the Department of Personnel Administration or its authorized representative shall make an investigation, with or without a hearing, as it deems necessary. However, if he or she receives one of the cited actions in more than three instances in any 12-month period, he or she, upon each additional action within the same 12-month period, shall be afforded a hearing before the State Personnel Board if he or she files an answer to the action.

(c) The Department of Personnel Administration shall not have the above authority with regard to formal reprimands. Formal reprimands shall not be appealable by the receiving employee by any means, except that the State Personnel Board, pursuant to its constitutional authority, shall maintain its right to review all formal reprimands. Formal reprimands shall remain available for use by the appointing authorities for the purpose of progressive discipline.

(d) Disciplinary action taken pursuant to this section is not subject to Sections 19180, 19574.1, 19574.2, 19575, 19575.5, 19579, 19580, 19581, 19581.5, 19582, 19583, and 19587, or to State Personnel Board Rules 51.1 to 51.9, inclusive, 52, and 52.1 to 52.5, inclusive. Disciplinary action taken pursuant to this section is not subject to judicial review.

(e) Notwithstanding any law or rule, if the provisions of this section are in conflict with the provisions of the memorandum of understanding reached pursuant to Section 3517.5, the memorandum of understanding shall be controlling without further legislative action, except that if the provisions of a memorandum of understanding require the expenditure of funds, the provisions shall not become effective unless approved by the Legislature in the annual Budget Act.

**Comment.** Section 19576.1 is amended to add the second sentence to subdivision (d). This continues the substance of former Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5(j).

LOCAL AGENCIES

**Gov't Code § 54963 (added). Decision; judicial review**

54963. (a) This section applies to a decision of a local agency, other than a school district, suspending, demoting, or dismissing an officer or employee, revoking or denying an application for a permit, license, or other entitlement, or denying an application for any retirement benefit or allowance.

(b) If the decision is not announced at the close of the hearing, the date, time, and place of the announcement of the decision shall be announced at the hearing.

(c) Judicial review of the decision shall be under Title 2 (commencing with 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

**Comment.** Subdivision (a) of Section 54963 continues subdivision (e) of former Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. Subdivision (b) continues the third sentence of subdivision (b) of former Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. Subdivision (c) is new.

ZONING ADMINISTRATION

**Gov't Code § 65907 (amended). Time for attacking administrative determination**

~~65907. (a) Except as otherwise provided by ordinance, any action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul~~ A proceeding for judicial review of any decision of matters listed in Sections 65901 and 65903, or concerning of any of the proceedings, acts, or determinations taken, done, or made prior to such the decision, or to determine the reasonableness, legality, or validity of any condition attached thereto, shall not be maintained by any person unless the action or proceeding is commenced within 90 days and the legislative body is served within 120 days after the date of the decision. Thereafter, shall be under Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure. After the time provided in Section 1123.650 of the Code of Civil Procedure has expired, all persons are barred from any such action or a proceeding for judicial review or any defense of invalidity or unreasonableness of that decision or of these proceedings, acts, or determinations. All actions A proceeding for judicial review brought pursuant to this section shall be given preference over all other civil matters before the court, except probate, eminent domain, and forcible entry and unlawful detainer proceedings.

(b) Notwithstanding Section 65803, this section shall apply to charter cities.

(c) The amendments to subdivision (a) shall apply to decisions made pursuant to this division on or after January 1, 1984.

**Comment.** Subdivision (a) of Section 65907 is amended to make proceedings to which it applies subject to the judicial review provisions in the Code of Civil Procedure. Subdivision (c) is deleted as no longer necessary.

PRIVATE HOSPITAL BOARDS

**Health & Safety Code §§ 1339.62-1339.64 (added). Judicial review**

Article 12. Judicial Review of Decision of Private Hospital Board

**§ 1339.62. Definitions**

1339.62. As used in this article:

(a) “Adjudicative proceeding” is defined in Section 1121.220 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

(b) “Decision” is defined in Section 1121.250 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

**Comment.** Section 1339.62 applies definitions applicable to the judicial review provisions in the Code of Civil Procedure.

**§ 1339.63. Judicial review; venue**

1339.63. (a) Judicial review of a decision of a private hospital board in an adjudicative proceeding shall be under Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

(b) The proper county for judicial review of a decision of a private hospital board in an adjudicative proceeding is determined under Title 4 (commencing with Section 392) of Part 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

**Comment.** Subdivision (a) of Section 1339.63 continues the effect of former Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5(d). See also *Anton v. San Antonio Community Hospital*, 19 Cal. 3d 802, 815-20, 567 P.2d 1162, 140 Cal. Rptr. 442 (1979) (administrative mandamus available to review action by private hospital board).

Subdivision (b) continues the substance of existing law. See Code Civ. Proc. § 1109; California Administrative Mandamus § 8.16, at 269 (Cal. Cont. Ed. Bar, 2d ed. 1989). See also Sections 1339.62 (“adjudicative proceeding” and “decision” defined); 1339.64 (standard of review of fact-finding).

Judicial review of a decision of a public hospital is also under Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1120-1123.950. See Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1120 (title applies to judicial review of agency action), 1121.130 (“agency” broadly defined to include all governmental entities).

**§ 1339.64. Standard of review of fact finding**

1339.64. The standard for judicial review of whether a decision of a private hospital board in an adjudicative proceeding is based on an erroneous determination of fact made or implied by the board is whether the board’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in the light of the whole record.

**Comment.** Section 1339.64 continues former Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5(d), except that the independent judgment standard of review of alleged discriminatory action under Section 1316 is not continued.

1 AGRICULTURAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

2 **Lab. Code § 1160.8 (amended). Review of final order of board; procedure**

3 1160.8. Any person aggrieved by the final order of the board granting or  
4 denying in whole or in part the relief sought may obtain a review of ~~such the~~  
5 order in the court of appeal having jurisdiction over the county wherein the  
6 unfair labor practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in, or wherein  
7 ~~such the~~ person resides or transacts business, by ~~filing in such court a written~~  
8 ~~petition requesting that the order of the board be modified or set aside. Such~~  
9 ~~petition shall be filed with the court within 30 days from the date of the issuance~~  
10 ~~of the board's order under Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of~~  
11 ~~the Code of Civil Procedure. Upon the filing of such the petition for review, the~~  
12 court shall cause notice to be served upon the board and thereupon shall have  
13 jurisdiction of the proceeding. The board shall file in the court the record of the  
14 proceeding, certified by the board within 10 days after the clerk's notice unless  
15 ~~such the~~ time is extended by the court for good cause shown. The court shall  
16 have jurisdiction to grant to the board ~~such any~~ temporary relief or restraining  
17 order it deems just and proper and in like manner to make and enter a decree  
18 enforcing, modifying and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in  
19 part, the order of the board. ~~The findings of the board with respect to questions of~~  
20 ~~fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole~~  
21 ~~shall in like manner be conclusive.~~

22 An order directing an election shall not be stayed pending review, but ~~such the~~  
23 order may be reviewed as provided in Section 1158.

24 If the time for review of the board order has lapsed, and the person has not  
25 voluntarily complied with the board's order, the board may apply to the superior  
26 court in any county in which the unfair labor practice occurred or wherein ~~such~~  
27 ~~the~~ person resides or transacts business for enforcement of its order. If after  
28 hearing, the court determines that the order was issued pursuant to procedures  
29 established by the board and that the person refuses to comply with the order, the  
30 court shall enforce ~~such the~~ order by writ of injunction or other proper process.  
31 The court shall not review the merits of the order.

32 **Comment.** Section 1160.8 is amended to make proceedings to which it applies subject to  
33 the judicial review provisions in the Code of Civil Procedure.

34 The former second sentence of Section 1160.8 which required the petition to be filed  
35 within 30 days from the date of issuance of the board's order is superseded by Code of Civil  
36 Procedure Section 1123.640. Under that section, the petition for review must be filed not later  
37 than 30 days after the decision is effective. A decision is effective 30 days after it is delivered  
38 or mailed to the respondent, unless the agency orders that it shall become effective sooner.  
39 Gov't Code § 11519.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

**Lab. Code § 5950 (amended). Judicial review**

5950. Any person affected by an order, decision, or award of the appeals board may, ~~within the time limit specified in this section, apply to petition the Supreme Court or to the court of appeal for the appellate district in which he the person resides, for a writ of judicial review, for the purpose of inquiring into and determining the lawfulness of the original order, decision, or award or of the order, decision, or award following reconsideration. The application for writ of review must be made within 45 days after a petition for reconsideration is denied, or, if a petition is granted or reconsideration is had on the appeal board's own motion, within 45 days after the filing of the order, decision, or award following reconsideration.~~

**Comment.** Section 5950 is amended to delete the second sentence specifying the time limit for judicial review. Under Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.640, the petition for review must be filed not later than 30 days after the decision is effective. A decision is effective 30 days after it is delivered or mailed to the respondent, unless the agency orders that it shall become effective sooner. Code Civ. Proc. § 1123.640(b)(2).

**Lab. Code § 5951 (repealed). Writ of review**

5951. ~~The writ of review shall be made returnable at a time and place then or thereafter specified by court order and shall direct the appeals board to certify its record in the case to the court within the time therein specified. No new or additional evidence shall be introduced in such court, but the cause shall be heard on the record of the appeals board as certified to by it.~~

**Comment.** Section 5951 is repealed because it is superseded by the judicial review provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure. See Section 5954. The provision in the first sentence for the return of the writ of review is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.710 (applicability of rules of practice for civil actions). The provision in the first sentence for the record of the department is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.820 (contents of administrative record). The second sentence is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1123.810 (administrative record exclusive basis for judicial review) and 1123.850 (new evidence on judicial review).

**Lab. Code § 5952 (repealed). Scope of review**

5952. ~~The review by the court shall not be extended further than to determine, based upon the entire record which shall be certified by the appeals board, whether:~~

- ~~(a) The appeals board acted without or in excess of its powers.~~
- ~~(b) The order, decision, or award was procured by fraud.~~
- ~~(c) The order, decision, or award was unreasonable.~~
- ~~(d) The order, decision, or award was not supported by substantial evidence.~~
- ~~(e) If findings of fact are made, such findings of fact support the order, decision, or award under review.~~

1     ~~Nothing in this section shall permit the court to hold a trial de novo, to take~~  
2     ~~evidence, or to exercise its independent judgment on the evidence.~~

3     **Comment.** Subdivisions (a) through (d) of former Section 5952 are superseded by Code of  
4     Civil Procedure Sections 1123.410-1123.460. See also Code Civ. Proc. § 1123.160  
5     (condition of relief).

6     Subdivision (e) is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.840 (disposal of  
7     administrative record). The last sentence is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Sections  
8     1123.420 (interpretation or application of law) and 1123.850 (new evidence). Nothing in the  
9     Code of Civil Procedure provisions or in this article permits the court to hold a trial de novo.

10   **Lab. Code § 5953 (amended). Right to appear in judicial review proceeding**

11     ~~5953. The findings and conclusions of the appeals board on questions of fact~~  
12     ~~are conclusive and final and are not subject to review. Such questions of fact~~  
13     ~~shall include ultimate facts and the findings and conclusions of the appeals board.~~  
14     ~~The parties to a judicial review proceeding are the appeals board and each party~~  
15     ~~to the action or proceeding before the appeals board shall have the right to~~  
16     ~~appear in the review proceeding. Upon the hearing, the court shall enter~~  
17     ~~judgment either affirming or annulling the order, decision, or award, or the court~~  
18     ~~may remand the case for further proceedings before the appeals board whose~~  
19     ~~interest is adverse to the petitioner for judicial review.~~

20     **Comment.** Section 5953 is largely superseded by the judicial review provisions of the Code  
21     of Civil Procedure. See Section 5954. The first sentence is superseded by Code of Civil  
22     Procedure Section 1123.430 (review of fact-finding). The second sentence is superseded by  
23     Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.420 (review of interpretation or application of law).  
24     The fourth sentence is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.730 (type of  
25     relief).

26   **Lab. Code § 5954 (amended). Judicial review**

27     ~~5954. The provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure relating to writs of review~~  
28     ~~shall, so far as applicable, apply to proceedings in the courts under the provisions~~  
29     ~~of this article. A copy of every pleading filed pursuant to the terms of this article~~  
30     ~~shall be served on the appeals board and upon every party who entered an~~  
31     ~~appearance in the action before the appeals board and whose interest therein is~~  
32     ~~adverse to the party filing such pleading. Judicial review shall be under Title 2~~  
33     ~~(commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure.~~

34     **Comment.** Section 5954 is amended to replace the former provisions with a reference to  
35     the judicial review provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure. Special provisions of this article  
36     prevail over general provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure governing judicial review. See  
37     Code Civ. Proc. § 1121.110 (conflicting or inconsistent statute controls). Copies of pleadings  
38     in judicial review proceedings must be served on the parties. See Code Civ. Proc. §§  
39     1123.610 (petition for review), 1123.710 (applicability of rules of practice for civil actions).

40   **Lab. Code § 5955 (amended). Courts having jurisdiction; mandate**

41     ~~5955. No court of this state, except the Supreme Court and the courts of appeal~~  
42     ~~to the extent herein specified, has jurisdiction to review, reverse, correct, or annul~~  
43     ~~any order, rule, decision, or award of the appeals board, or to suspend or delay the~~

operation or execution thereof, or to restrain, enjoin, or interfere with the appeals board in the performance of its duties ~~but a writ of mandate shall lie from the Supreme Court or a court of appeal in all proper cases.~~

**Comment.** Section 5955 is amended to delete the former reference to a writ of mandate. The writ of mandate has been replaced by a petition for review. See Section 5954; Code Civ. Proc. § 1123.610 (petition for review). See also Code Civ. Proc. § 1123.510(b) (original writ jurisdiction of Supreme Court and courts of appeal not affected).

**Lab. Code § 5956 (repealed). Stay of order**

~~5956. The filing of a petition for, or the pendency of, a writ of review shall not of itself stay or suspend the operation of any order, rule, decision, or award of the appeals board, but the court before which the petition is filed may stay or suspend, in whole or in part, the operation of the order, decision, or award of the appeals board subject to review, upon the terms and conditions which it by order directs, except as provided in Article 3 of this chapter.~~

**Comment.** Former Section 5956 is superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.720 (stays). The stay provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure are subject to Article 3 (commencing with Section 6000) (undertaking on stay order). See Code Civ. Proc. § 1121.110 (conflicting or inconsistent statute prevails).

**Lab. Code § 6000 (amended). Undertaking on stay order**

6000. The operation of any order, decision, or award of the appeals board under the provisions of this division or any judgment entered thereon, shall not at any time be stayed by the court to which petition is made for a writ of judicial review, unless an undertaking is executed on the part of the petitioner.

**Comment.** Section 6000 is amended reflect replacement of the writ of review by the judicial review procedure in Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure. The stay provisions of Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.720 are subject to this article. See Code Civ. Proc. § 1121.110 (conflicting or inconsistent statute prevails).

STATE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND  
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

**Pub. Res. Code § 25531.5 (added). Inapplicability of Code of Civil Procedure**

25531.5. Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure does not apply to judicial review of a decision of the commission on an application of an electric utility for certification of a site and related facility under this code.

**Comment.** Section 25531.5 makes clear the judicial review provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure do not apply to power plant siting decisions of the Energy Commission under this code.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

**Pub. Util. Code § 1768 (added). Inapplicability of Code of Civil Procedure**

1768. Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure does not apply to judicial review of proceedings of the commission under this code.

**Comment.** Section 1768 makes clear the judicial review provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure do not apply to proceedings of the Public Utilities Commission under this code.

PROPERTY TAXATION

**Rev. & Tax. Code § 2954 (amended). Assessee's challenge by writ**

2954. (a) An assessee may challenge a seizure of property made pursuant to Section 2953 by petitioning for a writ of prohibition or writ of mandate in the superior court review under Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure alleging:

- (1) That there are no grounds for the seizure;
- (2) That the declaration of the tax collector is untrue or inaccurate; and
- (3) That there are and will be sufficient funds to pay the taxes prior to the date such taxes become delinquent.

(b) As a condition of maintaining the special review proceedings for a writ, the assessee shall file with the tax collector a bond sufficient to pay the taxes and all fees and charges actually incurred by the tax collector as a result of the seizure, and shall furnish proof of the bond with the court. Upon the filing of the bond, the tax collector shall release the property to the assessee.

**Comment.** Section 2954 is amended to make judicial review under the section subject to general provisions in the Code of Civil Procedure for review of agency action.

**Rev. & Tax. Code § 2955 (technical amendment). Recovery of costs by assessee**

2955. If the assessee prevails in the special review proceeding for a writ under Section 2954, the assessee is entitled to recover from the county all costs, including attorney's fees, incurred by virtue of the seizure and subsequent actions, and the tax collector shall bear the costs of seizure and any fees and expenses of keeping the seized property. If, however, subsequent to the date the taxes in question become delinquent, the taxes are not paid in full and it becomes necessary for the tax collector to seize property of the assessee in payment of the taxes or to commence an action against the assessee for recovery of the taxes, in addition to all taxes and delinquent penalties, the assessee shall reimburse the county for all costs incurred at the time of the original seizure and all other costs charged to the tax collector or the county as a result of the original seizure and any subsequent actions.

**Comment.** Section 2955 is amended to recognize that judicial review under Section 2954 is subject to general provisions in the Code of Civil Procedure for review of agency action.

**Rev. & Tax. Code § 2956 (technical amendment). Precedence for court hearing**

2956. In all special review proceedings ~~for a writ~~ brought under this article, all courts in which such proceedings are pending shall, upon the request of any party thereto, give such proceedings precedence over all other civil actions and proceedings, except actions and proceedings to which special precedence is otherwise given by law, in the matter of the setting of them for hearing or trial and in their hearing or trial, to the end that all such proceedings shall be quickly heard and determined.

**Comment.** Section 2956 is amended to recognize that judicial review under this article is subject to general provisions in the Code of Civil Procedure for review of agency action.

**Rev. & Tax. Code § 5140 (amended). Action for refund of property taxes**

5140. The person who paid the tax, his or her guardian or conservator, the executor of his or her will, or the administrator of his or her estate may ~~bring an action only in the superior court~~ petition for judicial review under Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure against a county or a city to recover a tax which the board of supervisors of the county or the city council of the city has refused to refund on a claim filed pursuant to Article 1 (commencing with Section 5096) of this chapter. No other person may bring such an action; but if another should do so, judgment shall not be rendered for the plaintiff.

**Comment.** Section 5140 is amended to make actions for refund of property taxes subject to provisions in the Code of Civil Procedure for judicial review of agency action. This is consistent with case law under which judicial review of property taxes is on the administrative record, not a trial de novo. See *Bret Harte Inn, Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco*, 16 Cal. 3d 14, 544 P.2d 1354, 127 Cal. Rptr. 154 (1976); *DeLuz Homes, Inc. v. County of San Diego*, 45 Cal. 2d 546, 290 P.2d 544 (1955); *Prudential Ins. Co. v. City and County of San Francisco*, 191 Cal. App. 3d 11452, 236 Cal. Rptr. 869 (1987); *Kaiser Center, Inc. v. County of Alameda*, 189 Cal. App. 3d 978, 234 Cal. Rptr. 603 (1987); *Trailer Train Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization*, 180 Cal. App. 3d 565, 225 Cal. Rptr. 717 (1986); *Hunt-Wesson Foods, Inc. v. County of Alameda*, 41 Cal. App. 3d 163, 116 Cal. Rptr. 160 (1974); *Westlake Farms, Inc. v. County of Kings*, 39 Cal. App. 3d 179, 114 Cal. Rptr. 137 (1974).

STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

**Rev. & Tax. Code § 7279.6 (amended). Judicial review**

7279.6. An arbitrary and capricious action of the board in implementing the provisions of this chapter shall be reviewable ~~by writ~~ under Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

**Comment.** Section 7279.6 is amended to make judicial review under the section subject to general provisions in the Code of Civil Procedure for review of agency action.

CALIFORNIA UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BOARD

**Unemp. Ins. Code § 1243 (amended). Judicial review**

1243. A decision of the appeals board on an appeal from a denial of a protest under Section 1034 or on an appeal from a denial or granting of an application for transfer of reserve account under Article 5 (commencing with Section 1051) shall be subject to judicial review ~~if an appropriate proceeding is filed by the employer within 90 days of the service of notice of the decision~~ under Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure. The director may, in writing, extend for a period of not exceeding two years the time provided in Section 1123.640 of the Code of Civil Procedure within which such proceeding may be instituted if written request for such extension is filed with the director within the ~~90-day period~~ time prescribed by that section.

**Comment.** Section 1243 is amended to make clear that judicial review under the section shall be under Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1120-1123.950. The former 90-day time limit for a proceeding under this section is superseded by the time limit provided in Code of Civil Procedure Section 1123.640 (30 days from effective date of decision or giving of notice, whichever is later).

DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES

**Veh. Code § 13559 (amended). Petition for review**

13559. (a) Notwithstanding Section 14400 or 14401, ~~within 30 days of the issuance of the~~ a person who has been issued a notice of determination of the department sustaining an order of suspension or revocation of the person's privilege to operate a motor vehicle, after the hearing pursuant to Section 13558, ~~the person may file a petition for review of the order in the court of competent jurisdiction in the person's county of residence. The filing of a petition for judicial review shall not stay the order of suspension or revocation. The review shall be on the record of the hearing and the court shall not consider other evidence. If the court finds that the department exceeded its constitutional or statutory authority, made an erroneous interpretation of the law, acted in an arbitrary and capricious manner, or made a determination which is not supported by the evidence in the record,~~ Except as provided in this section, the proceedings shall be conducted under Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure. In addition to the relief authorized under Title 2, the court may order the department to rescind the order of suspension or revocation and return, or reissue a new license to, the person.

(b) A finding by the court after a review pursuant to this section shall have no collateral estoppel effect on a subsequent criminal prosecution and does not preclude relitigation of those same facts in the criminal proceeding.

**Comment.** Section 13559 is amended to make judicial review proceedings under the section subject to the judicial review provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure. The special venue rule of Section 13559 is preserved.

**Veh. Code § 14401 (amended). Statute of limitations on review**

14401. (a) Any action brought in a court of competent jurisdiction to review any order of the department refusing, canceling, placing on probation, suspending, or revoking the privilege of a person to operate a motor vehicle shall be commenced within 90 days from the date the order is noticed.

(b) Upon final completion of all administrative appeals, the person whose driving privilege was refused, canceled, placed on probation, suspended, or revoked shall be given written notice by the department of his or her right to a review by a court pursuant to subdivision (a) under Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

**Comment.** Subdivision (b) of Section 14401 is amended to recognize that judicial review is under Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1120-1123.950. See Code Civ. Proc. § 1120 (application of title).

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

**Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962 (amended). Judicial review**

10962. The applicant or recipient or the affected county, within one year after receiving notice of the director's final decision, may file a petition with the superior court, for review under the provisions of Section 1094.5 Title 2 (commencing with Section 1120) of Part 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure, praying for a review of the entire proceedings in the matter, upon questions of law involved in the case. Such . The review, if granted, shall be the exclusive remedy available to the applicant or recipient or county for review of the director's decision. The director shall be the sole respondent in such the proceedings. Immediately upon being served the director shall serve a copy of the petition on the other party entitled to judicial review and such that party shall have the right to intervene in the proceedings.

No filing fee shall be required for the filing of a petition for review pursuant to this section. Any such petition to the superior court The proceeding for judicial review shall be entitled to a preference in setting a date for hearing on the petition. No bond shall be required in the case of any petition for review, nor in any appeal therefrom from the decision of the superior court. The applicant or recipient shall be entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs, if he obtains a decision in his favor the applicant or recipient obtains a favorable decision.

**Comment.** Section 10962 is amended to make judicial review of a welfare decision of the Department of Social Services subject to the judicial review provisions in the Code of Civil Procedure. Judicial review is in the superior court. Code Civ. Proc. § 1123.510. The scope of review is prescribed in Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1123.410-1123.460. See also Code Civ. Proc. § 1123.160 (condition of relief).

Special provisions of this section prevail over general provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure governing judicial review. See Code Civ. Proc. § 1121.110 (conflicting or inconsistent statute controls).

UNCODIFIED

**Uncodified (added). Severability**

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The provisions of this act are severable. If any provision of this act or its application is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications that can be given effect without the invalid provision or application.

**Uncodified (added). Application of new law**

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. (a) This title applies to a proceeding commenced on or after January 1, 1998, for judicial review of agency action.

(b) The applicable law in effect before January 1, 1998, continues to apply to a proceeding for judicial review of agency action pending on January 1, 1988.