AUTHOR*



Phyllis W. Chen

CASES PENDING BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT

ARBITRATION

Basith v. Lithia Motors, Inc., 90 Cal. App. 5th 951 (2023); review granted, 2023 WL 5114947 (Aug. 9, 2023), S280258/B316098

The petition for review is granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of a related issue in *Fuentes v. Empire Nissan, Inc.*, S280256/B314490 (see Cal. Rules of Ct., rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court. Submission of additional briefing, pursuant to Cal. Rules of Ct., rule 8.520, is deferred pending further order of the court.

Holding for the lead case.

Colon-Perez v. Security Industry Specialists, Inc., 108 Cal. App. 5th 403 (2025); review granted, 2025 WL 1132079 (April 16, 2025), S289702/A168297

Petition for review after affirmance of order vacating order to compel arbitration under Code Civ. Proc. § 1281.98 and denying relief under § 473(b). Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of a related issue in , *Hohenshelt v. Superior Court*, S284498, which was decided on August 11, 2025 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court.

Holding for the lead case.

Fuentes v. Empire Nissan, 90 Cal. App. 5th 919 (2023); review granted, 2023 WL 5114942 (Aug. 9, 2023), S280256/B314490

Petition for review after reversal of order denying a petition to compel arbitration. Is the form arbitration agreement that the employer here required prospective employees to sign as a condition of employment unenforceable against an employee due to unconscionability? Fully briefed.

Hernandez v. Sohnen Enterprises, 102 Cal. App. 5th 222 (2024); review granted, 2024 WL 3893693 (Mem) (Aug. 21, 2024), \$285696/ B323303

Petition for review after reversal of judgment. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of a related issue in *Hohenshelt v. Superior Court*, S284498, which was decided on August 11, 2025 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d) (2)), or pending further order of the court. Submission of additional briefing, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.520, is deferred pending further order of the court.

Holding for the lead case.

Keeton v. Tesla, 103 Cal. App. 5th 26 (2024); review granted, 2024 WL 4160072 (Mem) (Sept. 11, 2024), S286260/A166690

Petition for review after affirmance of order vacating submission of dispute to arbitration. Briefing deferred pending decision in Hohenshelt v. Superior Court, S284498, which was decided on August 11, 2025. Does the Federal Arbitration Act (9 U.S.C. § 1 et seq.) preempt state statutes prescribing the procedures for paying arbitration fees and providing for forfeiture of the right to arbitrate if timely payment is not made by the party who drafted the arbitration agreement and who is required to pay such fees?

Holding for the lead case.

Rodriguez v. Packers Sanitation Services, Ltd., 109 Cal. App. 5th 69 (2025); review granted, 2025 WL 1404550 (May 14, 2025), S290182/ D083400

Petition for review after denial of motion to compel arbitration. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of related issues in Leeper v. Shipt, S289305 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court.

Holding for the lead case.

Zhang v. Superior Court, 85 Cal. App. 5th 167 (2022); review granted, 304 Cal. Rptr. 3d 549 (Mem) (Feb. 15, 2023), S277736/B314386

Petition for review after denial of petition for writ of mandate.

- 1. If an employer files a motion to compel arbitration in a non-California forum pursuant to a contractual forum selection clause, and an employee raises as a defense Cal. Lab. Code § 925, which prohibits an employer from requiring a California employee to agree to a provision requiring the employee to adjudicate outside of California a claim arising in California, is the court in the non-California forum one of "competent jurisdiction" (CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 1281.4) such that the motion to compel requires a mandatory stay of the California proceedings?
- 2. Does the presence of a delegation clause in an employment contract delegating issues of arbitrability to an arbitrator prohibit a California court from enforcing Cal. Lab. Code § 925 in opposition to the employer's stay motion?

Fully briefed.

RETIREMENT

Los Angeles County Emp. Retirement Ass'n v. County of Los Angeles, 102 Cal. App. 5th 1167(2024); review granted, 2024 WL 4511044 (Mem) (Oct. 16, 2024), S286264/ B326977

Petition for review after reversal of judgment.

- 1. Does the board of a county public employee retirement system established under the County Employees Retirement Law of 1937 (CERL) (CAL. Gov'T Code, § 31450, et seq.) have authority under the California Constitution and relevant statutes to create employment classifications and set salaries for employees of the retirement system?
- 2. Does Cal. Gov't Code § 31522.1 impose a ministerial duty on a county board of supervisors to include in the county's employment

- classifications and salary ordinance the classifications and salaries adopted by the board of a county public employee retirement system for employees of that system?
- 3. Do Proposition 162 (CAL. CONST., art. XVI, § 17) and CERL override a county board of supervisors' constitutional authority to establish civil service classifications, set salaries, and maintain a civil service system for county employees under article XI of the California Constitution?

Fully briefed.

San Jose v. Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Ass'n, 101 Cal. App. 5th 777 (2024); review granted, 2024 WL 3819092 (Aug. 14, 2024), S285426/H050889

Petition for review granted following affirmance of judgment. Is the issuance of pension obligation bonds to finance unfunded pension liability subject to the voter-approval requirement of article XVI, section 18, subdivision(a) of the California Constitution?

Submitted/opinion due.

Ventura County Employees' Retirement Ass'n v. Criminal Justice Attorneys Ass'n of Ventura County, 98 Cal. App. 5th 1119 (2024); review granted, 320 Cal. Rptr. 3d 117 (Mem) (April 17, 2024), S283978/B325277

Petition for review after affirmance of judgment. For purposes of calculating retirement benefits for members of County Employees Retirement Law of 1937 (CAL. GOV'T CODE § 31450 et seq.) retirement systems, does CAL. Gov'T Code § 31461(b)(2) exclude payments for accrued, but unused hours of annual leave that would exceed the maximum amount of leave that was earnable and payable in a calendar year?

Fully briefed.

WAGE AND HOUR

Camp v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc., 84 Cal. App. 5th 638 (2022); review granted (Feb. 1, 2023), S277518/H049033

Petition after reversal of judgment. Under California law, are employers permitted to use neutral timerounding practices to calculate employees' work time for payroll purposes?

Fully briefed.

CRST Expedited, Inc. v. Superior Ct., 112 Cal. App. 5th 872 (2025); review granted & depub. denied, 2025 WL 2671496 (Sept. 17, 2025), S292005/F088569

Petition for review after denial of writ of mandate and discharge of order to show cause and stay. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of related issues in Leeper v. Shipt, S289305 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court. Submission of additional briefing, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.520, is deferred pending further order of the court.

Holding for the lead case.

Leeper v. Shipt, Inc., 107 Cal. App. 5th 1001 (2024); review granted, 2025 WL 1132271 (April 16, 2025), S289305/ B339670

Review granted on court's own motion after denial of depublication.

- 1. Does every Private Attorneys General Act (CAL. LAB. CODE § 2698 et seq.) (PAGA) action necessarily include both individual and non-individual PAGA claims, regardless of whether the complaint specifically alleges individual claims?
- 2. Can a plaintiff choose to bring only a non-individual PAGA action?

Answer brief due.

Osuna v. Spectrum Security Serv., Inc., 111 Cal. App. 5th 516 (2025); review granted, 2025 WL 2167312 (July 30, 2025), S291614/B338047

Review granted after reversal and remand of order sustaining demurrer without leave to amend. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of related issues in Leeper v. Shipt, \$289305 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court.

Holding for the lead case.

Williams v. Alacrity Solutions Group, LLC, 110 Cal. App. 5th 932 (2025); review granted (July 9, 2025), S291199/ B335445

Petition after affirmance of judgment. Briefing deferred pending decision in Leeper v. Shipt, Inc., \$289305, which presents the following issues:

- 1. Does every Private Attorneys General Act (Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.) (PAGA) action necessarily include both individual and non-individual PAGA claims, regardless of whether the complaint specifically alleges individual claims?
- 2. Can a plaintiff choose to bring only a non-individual PAGA action?

Holding for the lead case.

WRONGFUL TERMINATION

Hearn v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 108 Cal. App. 5th 301 (2025); review granted, 2025 WL 1404484 (May 14, 2025), S289581A167742, A167991

Petition for review after affirmance in part and reversal in part of judgment. May a terminated employee bring a defamation claim against a former employer when the defamation allegedly contributed to the reasons for the termination of that employment or must such a claim be pursued under a wrongful discharge theory?

Answer brief due.

ENDNOTE

Phyllis W. Cheng is a neutral at ADR Services, Inc., and is on mediation panels for the California Court of Appeal, Second and Sixth Appellate Districts, and U.S. District Court, Central District of California. In addition to writing this column for 22 years, she also prepares the Labor & Employment Case Law Alert, a free electronic alert service on new cases for Section members. To subscribe online at http://www.calbar.ca.gov, log onto "My State Bar Profile" and follow the instructions under "Change My E-mail Addresses and List Subscriptions."