Judicial Council of California • Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688
www.courtinfo.ca.gov/invitationstocomment/

INVITATION TO COMMENT

CACI 11-01

Title
Civil Jury Instructions (CACI) Revisions

Proposed Revisions
Add and revise jury instructions

Recommended by
Advisory Committee on Civil Jury Instructions
Hon. H. Walter Croskey, Chair

Action Requested
Review and submit comments by March 4, 2011

Proposed Effective Date
June 11, 2011

Contact
Bruce Greenlee, Attorney, 415-865-7698
bruce.greenlee@jud.ca.gov

Summary

New and revised instructions and verdict forms reflecting recent developments in the law.

CIVIL JURY INSTRUCTIONS (CACI 11–01)
TABLE OF CONTENTS

108. Duty to Abide by Translation Provided in Court

Some testimony will be given in [*insert language other than English***]. An interpreter will provide a translation for you at the time that the testimony is given. You must rely solely on the translation provided by the interpreter, even if you understand the language spoken by the witness. Do not retranslate any testimony for other jurors. If you believe the court interpreter translated testimony incorrectly, let me know immediately by writing a note and giving it to the [clerk/bailiff/court attendant].**

New September 2003; Revised April 2004, June 2011

Sources and Authority

- It is misconduct for a juror to retranslate for other jurors testimony that has been translated by the court-appointed interpreter. (*People v. Cabrera* (1991) 230 Cal.App.3d 300, 303 [281 Cal.Rptr. 238].)

- "It is well-settled a juror may not conduct an independent investigation into the facts of the case or gather evidence from outside sources and bring it into the jury room. It is also misconduct for a juror to inject his or her own expertise into the jury's deliberation." (*People v. Cabrera*, *supra,* 230 Cal.App.3d at p. 303.)

- "If [the juror] believed the court interpreter was translating incorrectly, the proper action would have been to call the matter to the trial court's attention, not take it upon herself to provide her fellow jurors with the 'correct' translation." (*People v. Cabrera, supra,* 230 Cal.App.3d at p. 304.)

Secondary Sources

1 California Trial Guide, Unit 3, *Other Non-Evidentiary Motions*, § 3.32 (Matthew Bender)

1A California Trial Guide, Unit 20, *Procedural Rules for Presentation of Evidence*, § 20.13 (Matthew Bender)

4 California Trial Guide, Unit 91, *Jury Deliberations and Rendition of Verdict*, §§ 91.10, 91.12 (Matthew Bender)

112. Questions From Jurors

If, during the trial, you have a question that you believe should be asked of a witness, you may write out the question and send it to me through my courtroom staff. I will share your question with the attorneys and decide whether it may be asked.

Do not feel disappointed if your question is not asked. Your question may not be asked for a variety of reasons. For example, the question may call for an answer that is not allowed for legal reasons. Also, you should not try to guess the reason why a question is not asked or speculate about what the answer might have been. Because the decision whether to allow the question is mine alone, do not hold it against any of the attorneys or their clients if your question is not asked.

Remember that you are not an advocate for one side or the other. Each of you is an impartial judge of the facts. Your questions should be posed in as neutral a fashion as possible. Do not discuss any question asked by any juror with any other juror until after deliberations begin.

New February 2005; Revised April 2007, April 2009, June 2011

Directions for Use

This is an optional instruction for use if the jurors will be allowed to ask questions of the witnesses. For an instruction to be given at the end of the trial, see CACI No. 5019, *Questions From Jurors*. This instruction may ~~need to~~ be modified to account for an individual judge's practice.

Sources and Authority

- Rule 2.1033 of the California Rules of Court provides: "A trial judge should allow jurors to submit written questions directed to witnesses. An opportunity must be given to counsel to object to such questions out of the presence of the jury."

- "In a proper case there may be a real benefit from allowing jurors to submit questions under proper control by the court. However, in order to permit the court to exercise its discretion and maintain control of the trial, the correct procedure is to have the juror write the questions for consideration by the court and counsel prior to their submission to the witness." (*People v. McAlister* (1985) 167 Cal.App.3d 633, 644 [213 Cal.Rptr. 271].)

- "[T]he judge has discretion to ask questions submitted by jurors or to pass those questions on and leave to the discretion of counsel whether to ask the questions." (*People v. Cummings* (1993) 4 Cal.4th 1233, 1305 [18 Cal.Rptr.2d 796, 850 P.2d 1].)

- "The appellant urges that when jurymen ask improper questions the defendant is placed in the delicate dilemma of either allowing such question to go in without objection or of offending the jurors by making the objection and the appellant insists that the court of its own motion should check the putting of such improper questions by the jurymen, and thus relieve the party injuriously affected

thereby from the odium which might result from making that objection thereto. There is no force in this contention. Objections to questions, whether asked by a juror or by opposing counsel, are presented to the court, and its ruling thereon could not reasonably affect the rights or standing of the party making the objection before the jury in the one case more than in the other." (*Maris v. H. Crummey, Inc.* (1921) 55 Cal.App. 573, 578–579 [204 P. 259].)

Secondary Sources

3 Witkin, California Evidence (4th ed. 2000) Presentation at Trial, § 85

4 California Trial Guide, Unit 91, *Jury Deliberations and Rendition of Verdict*, §§ 91.01–91.03 (Matthew Bender)

115. "Class Action" Defined (Plaintiff Class)

A class action is a lawsuit that has been brought by one or more plaintiffs on behalf of a larger group of people who have similar legal claims. All of these people together are called a "class." [*Name of plaintiff***] brings this action as the class representative.**

In a class action, the claims of many individuals can be resolved at the same time instead of requiring each member to sue separately. Because of the large number of claims that are at issue in this case, not everyone in the class will testify. You may assume that the evidence at this trial applies to all class members. All members of the class will be bound by the result of this trial.

In this case, the class(es) consist(s) of the following:

[*Describe each class, e.g.,*

> *Original Homebuyers: All current homeowners in the Happy Valley subdivision in Pleasantville, California who purchased homes that were constructed and marketed by [*name of defendant*]. ("Class of Original Purchasers")*
>
> *Subsequent Homebuyers: All current homeowners in the Happy Valley subdivisions in Pleasantville, California who purchased homes that were constructed and marketed by [*name of defendant*] from another homeowner. ("Class of Later Purchasers")***]**

New June 2011

Directions for Use

The first paragraph may be modified for use with a defendant class. If in the course of the trial the court decertifies the class or one of the classes as to some or all issues, a concluding instruction explaining the effect of the decertification should be given.

Sources and Authority

- Code of Civil Procedure section 382 provides, in part:

  [W]hen the question is one of a common or general interest, of many persons, or when the parties are numerous, and it is impracticable to bring them all before the court, one or more may sue or defend for the benefit of all.

- "Courts long have acknowledged the importance of class actions as a means to prevent a failure of justice in our judicial system. ' "By establishing a technique whereby the claims of many individuals can be resolved at the same time, the class suit both eliminates the possibility of repetitious litigation and provides small claimants with a method of obtaining redress . . . ." ' Generally, a class suit is appropriate 'when numerous parties suffer injury of insufficient size to

warrant individual action and when denial of class relief would result in unjust advantage to the wrongdoer. 'But because group action also has the potential to create injustice, trial courts are required to ' "carefully weigh respective benefits and burdens and to allow maintenance of the class action only where substantial benefits accrue both to litigants and the courts." ' " (*Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 429, 434–435 [97 Cal.Rptr.2d 179 2 P.3d 27], internal citations omitted.)

- "[W]hen the question is one of a common or general interest, of many persons, or when the parties are numerous, and it is impracticable to bring them all before the court, one or more may sue or defend for the benefit of all." (*City of San Jose v. Superior Court* (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 447, 458 [115 Cal.Rptr. 797, 525 P.2d 701].)

- "The cases uniformly hold that a plaintiff seeking to maintain a class action must be a member of the class he claims to represent." (*La Sala v. American Sav. & Loan Assn.* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 875 [97 Cal.Rptr 849, 489 P.2d 1113].)

Secondary Sources

116. Why Electronic Communications and Research Are Prohibited

---

I want you to understand the reasons for these rules I have given you prohibiting all forms of electronic communications and research. I know that, for many of us, it requires a change in the way that we are used to communicating and perhaps even in the way that we are used to learning.

In court, jurors must make important decisions that have consequences for the parties. Those decisions must be based only on the evidence that you hear in this courtroom.

There are good reasons why you must not electronically communicate or do any research on anything having to do with this trial or the parties. The evidence that is presented in court can be tested; it can be shown to be right or wrong by either side; it can be questioned; and it can be contradicted by other evidence. What you might read or hear on your own could easily be wrong, out of date, or inapplicable to this case.

The whole point of a trial is to ensure that the facts on which you base your decisions are presented to you as a group, with each juror having the same opportunity to see, hear, and evaluate the evidence. In that way, all parties can receive a fair trial.

Also, a trial is a public process that depends on disclosure in the courtroom of facts and evidence. Using information gathered in secret by one or more jurors undermines the public process and violates the rights of the parties.

New June 2011

Directions for Use

Give this instruction after CACI No. 100, Preliminary Admonitions, in order to provide more information to the jury as to the reasons why independent electronic research using the internet and electronic communications are prohibited.

Sources and Authority

-

Secondary Sources

The deletion from the Directions for Use below would be made in all instructions in which the user is instructed to omit uncontested elements: 302, 303, 325, 2500, 2502, 2601, 2900, 2920, 3230, 4301, 4302, 4304, 4306, 4500, 4501, 4502, and 4510.

302. Contract Formation—Essential Factual Elements

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that the parties entered into a contract. To prove that a contract was created, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That the contract terms were clear enough that the parties could understand what each was required to do;**

2. **That the parties agreed to give each other something of value. [A promise to do something or not to do something may have value]; and**

3. **That the parties agreed to the terms of the contract.**

[When you examine whether the parties agreed to the terms of the contract, ask yourself if, under the circumstances, a reasonable person would conclude, from the words and conduct of each party, that there was an agreement. You may not consider the parties' hidden intentions.]

If [*name of plaintiff***] did not prove all of the above, then a contract was not created.**

New September 2003; Revised October 2004, June 2011

Directions for Use

This instruction should only be given if the existence of a contract is contested. If both parties agree that they had a contract, then the instructions relating to whether or not a contract was actually formed would not need to be given. At other times, the parties may be contesting only a limited number of contract formation issues. Also, some of these issues may be decided by the judge as a matter of law. ~~Users should omit elements in this instruction that are not contested so that the jury can focus on the contested issues.~~ Read the bracketed paragraph only if element 3 is read.

The elements regarding legal capacity and legal purpose are omitted from this instruction because these issues are not likely to be before the jury. If legal capacity or legal purpose is factually disputed then this instruction should be amended to add that issue as an element. Regarding legal capacity, the element could be stated as follows: "That the parties were legally capable of entering into a contract." Regarding legal purpose, the element could be stated as follows: "That the contract had a legal purpose."

The final element of this instruction would be given prior to instructions on offer and acceptance. If neither offer nor acceptance is contested, then this element of the instruction will not need to be given to the jury.

Sources and Authority

- Civil Code section 1550 provides:
  It is essential to the existence of a contract that there should be:

  1. Parties capable of contracting;

  2. Their consent;

  3. A lawful object; and

  4. A sufficient cause or consideration.

- Civil Code section 1556 provides: "All persons are capable of contracting, except minors, persons of unsound mind, and persons deprived of civil rights."

- The issue of whether a contract is illegal or contrary to public policy is a question of law. (*Jackson v. Rogers & Wells* (1989) 210 Cal.App.3d 336, 350 [258 Cal.Rptr. 454].)

- "In order for acceptance of a proposal to result in the formation of a contract, the proposal 'must be sufficiently definite, or must call for such definite terms in the acceptance, that the performance promised is reasonably certain.' [Citation.]" (*Weddington Productions, Inc. v. Flick* (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 793, 811 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 265].)

- Section 33(1) of the Restatement Second of Contracts provides: "Even though a manifestation of intention is intended to be understood as an offer, it cannot be accepted so as to form a contract unless the terms of the contract are reasonably certain." Section 33(2) provides: "The terms of a contract are reasonably certain if they provide a basis for determining the existence of a breach and for giving an appropriate remedy."

- Courts have stated that the issue of whether a contract is sufficiently definite is a question of law for the court. (*Ladas v. California State Automobile Assn.* (1993) 19 Cal.App.4th 761, 770, fn. 2 [23 Cal.Rptr.2d 810]; *Ersa Grae Corp. v. Fluor Corp.* (1991) 1 Cal.App.4th 613, 623 [2 Cal.Rptr.2d 288].)

- Civil Code section 1605 defines "good consideration" as follows: "Any benefit conferred, or agreed to be conferred, upon the promisor, by any other person, to which the promisor is not lawfully entitled, or any prejudice suffered, or agreed to be suffered, by such person, other than such as he is at the time of consent lawfully bound to suffer, as an inducement to the promisor is a good consideration for a promise."

- Civil Code section 1614 provides: "A written instrument is presumptive evidence of consideration."

Civil Code section 1615 provides: "The burden of showing a want of consideration sufficient to support an instrument lies with the party seeking to invalidate or avoid it."

- In *Rancho Santa Fe Pharmacy, Inc. v. Seyfert* (1990) 219 Cal.App.3d 875, 884 [268 Cal.Rptr. 505], the court concluded that the presumption of consideration in section 1614 goes to the burden of producing evidence, not the burden of proof.

- Lack of consideration is an affirmative defense and must be alleged in answer to the complaint. (*National Farm Workers Service Center, Inc. v. M. Caratan, Inc.* (1983) 146 Cal.App.3d 796, 808 [194 Cal.Rptr. 617].)

- "Consideration consists not only of benefit received by the promisor, but of detriment to the promisee. ... 'It matters not from whom the consideration moves or to whom it goes. If it is bargained for and given in exchange for the promise, the promise is not gratuitous.' " (*Flojo Internat., Inc. v. Lassleben* (1992) 4 Cal.App.4th 713, 719 [6 Cal.Rptr.2d 99], internal citation omitted.)

- "Consideration may be an act, forbearance, change in legal relations, or a promise." (1 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Contracts, § 202.)

- Mutual consent is an essential contract element. (Civ. Code, § 1550.) Under Civil Code section 1565, "[t]he consent of the parties to a contract must be: 1. Free; 2. Mutual; and 3. Communicated by each to the other." Civil Code section 1580 provides, in part: "Consent is not mutual, unless the parties all agree upon the same thing in the same sense."

- California courts use the objective standard to determine mutual consent: "[A plaintiff's] uncommunicated subjective intent is not relevant. The existence of mutual assent is determined by objective criteria. The test is whether a reasonable person would, from the conduct of the parties, conclude that there was mutual agreement." (*Hilleary v. Garvin* (1987) 193 Cal.App.3d 322, 327 [238 Cal.Rptr. 247], internal citations omitted; see also *Roth v. Malson* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 552, 557 [79 Cal.Rptr.2d 226].)

- Actions as well as words are relevant: "The manifestation of assent to a contractual provision may be 'wholly or partly by written or spoken words or by other acts or by failure to act.' " (*Merced County Sheriff's Employees' Assn. v. County of Merced* (1987) 188 Cal.App.3d 662, 670 [233 Cal.Rptr. 519] (quoting Rest. 2d Contracts, § 19).)

- The surrounding circumstances can also be relevant in determining whether a binding contract has been formed. (*California Food Service Corp., Inc. v. Great American Insurance Co.* (1982) 130 Cal.App.3d 892, 897 [182 Cal.Rptr. 67].) "If words are spoken under circumstances where it is obvious that neither party would be entitled to believe that the other intended a contract to result, there is no contract." (*Fowler v. Security-First National Bank* (1956) 146 Cal.App.2d 37, 47 [303 P.2d 565].)

Secondary Sources

1 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Contracts, §§ 26, 50, 58, 116–255, 419, 420

13 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 140, *Contracts*, §§ 140.10, 140.20–140.25 (Matthew Bender)

5 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 50, *Contracts*, § 50.350 et seq. (Matthew Bender)

27 California Legal Forms, Ch. 75, *Formation of Contracts and Standard Contractual Provisions*, §§ 75.10, 75.11 (Matthew Bender)

1 Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Contract Litigation, Ch. 13, *Attacking or Defending Existence of Contract—Absence of Essential Element*, 13.03–13.17

333. Affirmative Defense—Economic Duress

[*Name of defendant***] claims that there was no contract because [his/her/its] consent was given under duress. To succeed, [***name of defendant***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***] used a wrongful act or wrongful threat to pressure [***name of defendant***] into consenting to the contract;**

2. **That a reasonable person in [***name of defendant***]'s position would have felt that he or she had no reasonable alternative except to consent to the contract; and**

3. **That [***name of defendant***] would not have consented to the contract without the wrongful act or wrongful threat.**

An act or a threat is wrongful if [*insert relevant rule, e.g., "a bad-faith breach of contract is threatened"***].**

If you decide that [*name of defendant***] has proved all of the above, then no contract was created.**

New September 2003; Revised December 2005, June 2011

Directions for Use

Different elements may apply if economic duress is alleged to avoid an agreement to settle a debt. (See *Perez v. Uline, Inc.* (2007) 157 Cal.App.4th 953, 959–960 [68 Cal.Rptr.3d 872].)

Sources and Authority

- The Civil Code provides that consent is not free when obtained through duress, menace, fraud, undue influence, or mistake, and is deemed to have been so obtained when it would not have been given but for such fraud or mistake. (Civ. Code, §§ 1567, 1568.)

- The doctrine of economic duress has been described recently as follows: " 'As it has evolved to the present day, the economic duress doctrine is not limited by early statutory and judicial expressions requiring an unlawful act in the nature of a tort or a crime. Instead, the doctrine now may come into play upon the doing of a wrongful act which is sufficiently coercive to cause a reasonably prudent person faced with no reasonable alternative to succumb to the perpetrator's pressure. The assertion of a claim known to be false or a bad faith threat to breach a contract or to withhold a payment may constitute a wrongful act for purposes of the economic duress doctrine.' " (*Philippine Export and Foreign Loan Guarantee Corp. v. Chuidian* (1990) 218 Cal.App.3d 1058, 1077-1078 [267 Cal.Rptr. 457], internal citations omitted.)

- ~~Economic duress is evaluated under an objective standard:~~ "The doctrine of 'economic duress' can

apply when one party has done a wrongful act which is sufficiently coercive to cause a reasonably prudent person, faced with no reasonable alternative, to agree to an unfavorable contract. The party subjected to the coercive act, and having no reasonable alternative, can then plead 'economic duress' to avoid the contract." (*CrossTalk Productions, Inc. v. Jacobson* (1998) 65 Cal.App.4th 631, 644 [76 Cal.Rptr.2d 615], internal citation omitted.)

- The nonexistence of a "reasonable alternative" is a question of fact. (*CrossTalk Productions, Inc., supra,* 65 Cal.App.4th at p. 644.)

- " 'At the outset it is helpful to acknowledge the various policy considerations which are involved in cases involving economic duress. Typically, those claiming such coercion are attempting to avoid the consequences of a modification of an original contract or of a settlement and release agreement. On the one hand, courts are reluctant to set aside agreements because of the notion of freedom of contract and because of the desirability of having private dispute resolutions be final. On the other hand, there is an increasing recognition of the law's role in correcting inequitable or unequal exchanges between parties of disproportionate bargaining power and a greater willingness to not enforce agreements which were entered into under coercive circumstances.' " (*Rich & Whillock, Inc. v. Ashton Development, Inc.* (1984) 157 Cal.App.3d 1154, 1158 [204 Cal.Rptr. 86].)

- " 'As it has evolved to the present day, the economic duress doctrine is not limited by early statutory and judicial expressions requiring an unlawful act in the nature of a tort or a crime. … Instead, the doctrine now may come into play upon the doing of a wrongful act which is sufficiently coercive to cause a reasonably prudent person faced with no reasonable alternative to succumb to the perpetrator's pressure. … The assertion of a claim known to be false or a bad faith threat to breach a contract or to withhold a payment may constitute a wrongful act for purposes of the economic duress doctrine. … Further, a reasonably prudent person subject to such an act may have no reasonable alternative but to succumb when the only other alternative is bankruptcy or financial ruin. …' " (*Chan v. Lund* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 1159, 1174 [116 Cal.Rptr.3d 122].)

- "Economic duress has been recognized as a basis for rescinding a settlement. However, the courts, in desiring to protect the freedom of contracts and to accord finality to a privately negotiated dispute resolution, are reluctant to set aside settlements and will apply 'economic duress' only in limited circumstances and as a 'last resort.' " (*San Diego Hospice v. County of San Diego* (1995) 31 Cal.App.4th 1048, 1058 [37 Cal.Rptr.2d 501].)

- "Required criteria that must be proven to invalidate a settlement agreement are: '(1) the debtor knew there was no legitimate dispute and that it was liable for the full amount; (2) the debtor nevertheless refused in bad faith to pay and thereby created the economic duress of imminent bankruptcy; (3) the debtor, knowing the vulnerability its own bad faith had created, used the situation to escape an acknowledged debt; and (4) the creditor was forced to accept an inequitably low amount. …' " (*Perez, supra,* 157 Cal.App.4th at pp. 959–960.)

Secondary Sources

1 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Contracts, §§ 313–315

17 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake,* §§ 215.22, 215.122 (Matthew Bender)

9 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 92, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake,* § 92.24 (Matthew Bender)

1 Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Contract Litigation, Ch. 8, *Seeking or Opposing Equitable Remedies in Contract Actions,* 8.07

1 Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Contract Litigation, Ch. 17, *Attacking or Defending Existence of Contract—Fraud, Duress, Menace, and Undue Influence,* 17.03–17.06, 17.20–17.24[2]

417. Special Doctrines: Res ipsa loquitur

In this case, [*name of plaintiff***] may prove that [***name of defendant***]'s negligence caused [his/her] harm if [he/she] proves all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm ordinarily would not have happened unless someone was negligent;**

2. **That the harm was caused by something that only [***name of defendant***] controlled; and**

3. **That [***name of plaintiff***]'s voluntary actions did not cause or contribute to the event[s] that harmed [him/her].**

If you decide that [*name of plaintiff***] did not prove one or more of these three things, ~~[your verdict must be for [*name of defendant*].]~~**

~~*[or]*~~

~~[~~**you must decide whether [***name of defendant***] was negligent in light of the other instructions I have read.**~~]~~

If you decide that [*name of plaintiff***] proved all of these three things, you may, but are not required to, find that [***name of defendant***] was negligent or that [***name of defendant***]'s negligence was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm, or both.**

~~**You must carefully consider the evidence presented by both [*name of plaintiff*] and [*name of defendant*] before you make your decision. You should not decide in favor of [*name of plaintiff*] unless you believe, after weighing all of the evidence, that it is more probable than not that [*name of defendant*] was negligent and that [his/her] negligence was a substantial factor in causing [*name of plaintiff*]'s harm.**~~

New September 2003; Revised June 2011

Directions for Use

If the plaintiff establishes res ipsa loquitur but the defendant presented rebuttal evidence, the presumption drops out, and the plaintiff must then prove the elements of negligence without the benefit of the presumption of res ipsa loquitur. If the plaintiff fails to establish res ipsa loquitur as a presumption, the jury may still find for the plaintiff if it finds the plaintiff's evidence presented in support of res ipsa loquitur more persuasive than the defendant's evidence. (See *Howe v. Seven Forty Two Co., Inc.* (2010) 189 Cal.App.4th 1155, 1163–1164 [117 Cal.Rptr.3d 126].)~~In the second paragraph, the first bracketed option is to be used when plaintiff is relying solely on a res ipsa loquitur theory and has introduced no other evidence of defendant's negligence. The second option is to be used when plaintiff has introduced other evidence of defendant's negligence.~~

~~"It follows that where part of the facts basic to the application of the doctrine of res ipsa loquitur is established as a matter of law but that others are not, the court should instruct that application of the doctrine by the jury depends only upon the existence of the basic facts not conclusively established." (*Rimmele v. Northridge Hospital Foundation* (1975) 46 Cal.App.3d 123, 130 [120 Cal.Rptr. 39].)~~

Sources and Authority

- Evidence Code section 646(c) provides:

  > If the evidence, or facts otherwise established, would support a res ipsa loquitur presumption and the defendant has introduced evidence which would support a finding that he was not negligent or that any negligence on his part was not a proximate cause of the occurrence, the court may, and upon request shall, instruct the jury to the effect that:
  >
  > (1) If the facts which would give rise to a res ipsa loquitur presumption are found or otherwise established, the jury may draw the inference from such facts that a proximate cause of the occurrence was some negligent conduct on the part of the defendant; and
  >
  > (2) The jury shall not find that a proximate cause of the occurrence was some negligent conduct on the part of the defendant unless the jury believes, after weighing all the evidence in the case and drawing such inferences therefrom as the jury believes are warranted, that it is more probable than not that the occurrence was caused by some negligent conduct on the part of the defendant.

- Evidence Code section 604 provides:

  > The effect of a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence is to require the trier of fact to assume the existence of the presumed fact unless and until evidence is introduced which would support a finding of its nonexistence, in which case the trier of fact shall determine the existence or nonexistence of the presumed fact from the evidence and without regard to the presumption. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the drawing of any inference that may be appropriate.

- "In California, the doctrine of res ipsa loquitur is defined by statute as 'a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence.' The presumption arises when the evidence satisfies three conditions: '(1) the accident must be of a kind which ordinarily does not occur in the absence of someone's negligence; (2) it must be caused by an agency or instrumentality within the exclusive control of the defendant; (3) it must not have been due to any voluntary action or contribution on the part of the plaintiff.' A presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence 'require[s] the trier of fact to assume the existence of the presumed fact' unless the defendant introduces evidence to the contrary. The presumed fact, in this context, is that 'a proximate cause of the occurrence was some negligent conduct on the part of the defendant ... .' If the defendant introduces 'evidence which would support a finding that he was not negligent or that any negligence on his part was not a proximate cause of the occurrence,' the trier of fact determines whether defendant was negligent without regard to the

presumption, simply by weighing the evidence." (*Brown v. Poway Unified School Dist.* (1993) 4 Cal.4th 820, 825-826 [15 Cal.Rptr.2d 679, 843 P.2d 624], internal citations omitted.)

- " 'The doctrine of res ipsa loquitur is applicable where the accident is of such a nature that it can be said, in the light of past experience, that it probably was the result of negligence by someone and that the defendant is probably the one responsible.' " (*Howe*, *supra*, 189 Cal.App.4th at p. 1161.)~~Stated less mechanically, a plaintiff suing in a personal injury action is entitled to the benefit of res ipsa loquitur when: 'the accident is of such a nature that it can be said, in the light of past experience, that it probably was the result of negligence by someone and that the defendant is probably the person who is responsible.' " (*Rimmele*, *supra*, 46 Cal.App.3d at p. 129, internal citations omitted.)~~

- "Res ipsa loquitur is an evidentiary rule for 'determining whether circumstantial evidence of negligence is sufficient.' " (*Howe*, *supra*, 189 Cal.App.4th at p. 1161, internal citation omitted.)

- ~~Under Evidence Code section 604, a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence "require[s] the trier of fact to assume the existence of the presumed fact" unless the defendant introduces evidence to the contrary. Here, the presumed fact is that "a proximate cause of the occurrence was some negligent conduct on the part of the defendant." (Evid. Code, § 646(c)(1); *Brown*, *supra*, 4 Cal.4th at p. 826.)~~

- ~~"The doctrine of res ipsa loquitur is fundamentally a doctrine predicated upon inference deducible from circumstantial evidence." (*Hale v. Venuto* (1982) 137 Cal.App.3d 910, 918 [187 Cal.Rptr. 357].)~~

- The doctrine "is based on a theory of 'probability' where there is no direct evidence of defendant's conduct, permitting a common sense inference of negligence from the happening of the accident." (*Gicking v. Kimberlin* (1985) 170 Cal.App.3d 73, 75 [215 Cal.Rptr. 834].)

- "All of the cases hold, in effect, that it must appear, either as a matter of common experience or from evidence in the case, *that the accide*nt is of a type which probably would not happen unless someone was negligent." (*Zentz v. Coca Cola Bottling Co. of Fresno* (1952) 39 Cal.2d 436, 442-443 [247 P.2d 344].)

- The purpose of the second "control" requirement is to "link the defendant with the probability, already established, that the accident was negligently caused." (*Newing v. Cheatham* (1975) 15 Cal.3d 351, 362 [124 Cal.Rptr. 193, 540 P.2d 33].)~~ The control requirement is not absolute. (*Zentz*, *supra*, 39 Cal.2d at p. 443.)~~

- "The purpose of [the third] requirement, like that of control by the defendant is to establish that the defendant is the one probably responsible for the accident. The plaintiff need not show that he was entirely inactive at the time of the accident in order to satisfy this requirement, so long as the evidence is such as to eliminate his conduct as a factor contributing to the occurrence." (*Newing*, *supra*, 15 Cal.3d at p. 363, internal citations omitted.)

- The third condition "should not be confused with the problem of contributory negligence, as to which defendant has the burden of proof. ... [I]ts purpose, like that of control by the defendant, is merely to assist the court in determining whether it is more probable than not that the defendant was responsible

for the accident." (*Zentz, supra,* 39 Cal.2d at p. 444.)

- "[Evidence Code section 646] … classified the doctrine as a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence. Under that classification, when the predicate facts are established to give rise to the presumption, the burden of producing evidence to rebut it shifts to the defendant to prove lack of negligence or lack of proximate cause that the injury claimed was the result of that negligence. As a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence (as distinguished from a presumption affecting the burden of proof), if evidence is presented to rebut the presumed fact, the presumption is out of the case—it 'disappears.' But if no such evidence is submitted, the trier of fact must find the presumed fact to be established." (*Howe, supra,* 189 Cal.App.4th at p. 1162.)

- " 'If evidence is produced that would support a finding that the defendant was not negligent or that any negligence on his part was not a proximate cause of the accident, the presumptive effect of the doctrine vanishes.' '[T]he mere introduction of evidence sufficient to sustain a finding of the nonexistence of the presumed fact causes the presumption, as a matter of law, to disappear.' When the presumptive effect vanishes, it is the plaintiff's burden to introduce actual evidence that would show that the defendant is negligent and that such negligence was the proximate cause of the accident." (*Howe*, *supra*, 189 Cal.App.4th at p. 1163.)

- "As the [Law Revision Commission] Comment [to Evidence Code section 646] explains, even though the presumptive effect of the doctrine vanishes, 'the jury may still be able to draw an inference that the accident was caused by the defendant's lack of due care from the facts that gave rise to the presumption. … [¶] … [¶] … An inference of negligence may well be warranted from all of the evidence in the case even though the plaintiff fails to establish all the elements of res ipsa loquitur. In appropriate cases, therefore, the jury may be instructed that, even though it does not find that the facts giving rise to the presumption have been proved by a preponderance of the evidence, it may nevertheless find the defendant negligent if it concludes from a consideration of all the evidence that it is more probable than not that the defendant was negligent.' " (*Howe*, *supra*, 189 Cal.App.4th at p. 1163.)

- "It follows that where part of the facts basic to the application of the doctrine of res ipsa loquitur is established as a matter of law but that others are not, the court should instruct that application of the doctrine by the jury depends only upon the existence of the basic facts not conclusively established." ((*Rimmele v. Northridge Hospital Foundation* (1975) 46 Cal.App.3d 123, 130 [120 Cal.Rptr. 39].)

Secondary Sources

1 Witkin, California Evidence (4th ed. 2000) Burden of Proof and Presumptions, §§ 114-118, pp. 250–256

1 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 3, *Proof of Negligence,* § 3.20 et seq. (Matthew Bender)

1A California Trial Guide, Unit 11, *Opening Statement,* § 11.42, Unit 90, *Closing Argument,* § 90.90 (Matthew Bender)

33 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 380, *Negligence,* § 380.11 (Matthew Bender)

16 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 165, *Negligence*, § 165.340 et seq. (Matthew Bender)

427. Furnishing Alcoholic Beverages to Minors (Civ. Code, § 1714(d))

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims [***name of defendant***] is responsible for [his/her] harm because [***name of defendant***] furnished alcoholic beverages to [***name of alleged minor***], a minor at [***name of defendant***]'s home.**

To establish this claim, [*name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] was an adult;**

2. **That [***name of defendant***] knowingly furnished alcoholic beverages to [***name of alleged minor***] at [***name of defendant***]'s home;**

3. **That [***name of alleged minor***] was less than 21 years old at the time;**

4. **That [***name of alleged minor***] harmed [***name of plaintiff***]; and**

5. **That [***name of defendant***]'s furnishing alcoholic beverages to [***name of alleged minor***] was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

New June 2011

Directions for Use

Under a similar statute providing for business liability for furnishing alcohol to an obviously intoxicated minor (see Bus. & Prof. Code, § 25602.1), the furnisher can be liable for injuries to the minor. (See *Chalup v. Aspen Mine Co.* (1985) 175 Cal.App.3d 973, 974 [221 Cal.Rptr. 97]; CACI No. 422, *Sale of Alcoholic Beverages to Obviously Intoxicated Minors*.) Whether the same rule applies to social hosts is undecided. If the plaintiff is the minor who is suing for his or her own injuries, the instruction may be modified by substituting the appropriate pronoun for "[*name of alleged minor*]" throughout.

It is not clear from the statute whether the parent, guardian, or adult must know that the person being furnished alcohol is under age 21. Element 2 assumes that there is no requirement that the defendant know that the person is a minor. If the court decides that knowledge of the minor's age is required, an element to that effect should be added.

Sources and Authority

- Civil Code section 1714 provides, in relevant part:

  (c) Except as provided in subdivision (d), no social host who furnishes alcoholic beverages to any person may be held legally accountable for damages suffered by that person, or for injury to the person or property of, or death of, any third person, resulting from the consumption of those beverages.

(d) Nothing in subdivision (c) shall preclude a claim against a parent, guardian, or another adult who knowingly furnishes alcoholic beverages at his or her residence to a person under 21 years of age, in which case, notwithstanding subdivision (b), the furnishing of the alcoholic beverage may be found to be the proximate cause of resulting injuries or death.

Secondary Sources

1201. Strict Liability—Manufacturing Defect—Essential Factual Elements

---

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that the [***product***] contained a manufacturing defect. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] [manufactured/distributed/sold] the [***product***];**

2. **That the [***product***] contained a manufacturing defect when it left [***name of defendant***]'s possession;**

3. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed ~~while using the [*product*] in a reasonably foreseeable way~~; and**

4. **That the [***product***]'s defect was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

New September 2003; Revised April 2009, December 2009, June 2011

Directions for Use

To make a prima facie case, the plaintiff has the initial burden of producing evidence that he or she was injured while using the product in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner. If this prima facie burden is met, the burden of proof shifts to the defendant to prove that the plaintiff's injury resulted from a misuse of the product. (See *Perez v. VAS S.p.A.* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 658, 678 [115 Cal.Rptr.3d 590]; *Cronin v. J.B.E. Olson Corp.* (1972) 8 Cal. 3d 121, 125–126 [104 Cal.Rptr. 432, 501 P.2d 1153 [product misuse asserted as a defense to manufacturing defect].) See also CACI No. 1245, *Affirmative Defense—Product Misuse or Modification*. Product misuse is a complete defense to strict products liability if the defendant proves that an unforeseeable abuse or alteration of the product after it left the manufacturer's hands was the sole or superseding cause of the plaintiff's ~~reason that the product caused~~ injury. (*Campbell v. Southern Pacific Co.* (1978) 22 Cal.3d 51, 56 [148 Cal.Rptr. 596, 583 P.2d 121]; see CACI No. 1245.) ~~See CACI No. 1245, *Affirmative Defense—Product Misuse or Modification.*~~ Misuse or modification that was a substantial factor in, but not the sole or superseding cause of, plaintiff's harm may also be considered in determining the comparative fault of the plaintiff or of third persons. See CACI No. 1207A, *Strict Liability—Comparative Fault of Plaintiff,* and CACI No. 1207B, *Strict Liability—Comparative Fault of Third Person.*

Sources and Authority

- "A manufacturing defect occurs when an item is manufactured in a substandard condition." (*Gonzalez v. Autoliv ASP, Inc.* (2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 780, 792 [64 Cal.Rptr.3d 908].)

- "[I]n reviewing this record for substantial evidence in support of a manufacturing or production defect theory, we must keep in mind the two formulations of the test: A defective product is one that 'differs from the manufacturer's intended result or from other ostensibly identical units of the same

product line.' " (*In re Coordinated Latex Glove Litigation* (2002) 99 Cal.App.4th 594, 611 [121 Cal.Rptr.2d 301].)

- " 'Regardless of the theory which liability is predicated upon ... it is obvious that to hold a producer, manufacturer, or seller liable for injury caused by a particular product, there must first be proof that the defendant produced, manufactured, sold, or was in some way responsible for the product ... .' " (*Garcia v. Joseph Vince Co.* (1978) 84 Cal.App.3d 868, 874 [148 Cal.Rptr. 843], internal citation omitted.)

- "[W]here a plaintiff alleges a product is defective, proof that the product has malfunctioned is essential to establish liability for an injury *caused by the defect*." (*Khan v. Shiley Inc.* (1990) 217 Cal.App.3d 848, 855 [266 Cal.Rptr. 106], original italics.)

- In California, there is no requirement that the plaintiff prove that the defect made the product "unreasonably dangerous." (*Cronin v. J.B.E. Olson Corp.* (1972) 8 Cal.3d 121, 134-135 [104 Cal.Rptr. 433, 501 P.2d 1153].) Also, the plaintiff does not have to prove that he or she was unaware of the defect. (*Luque v. McLean* (1972) 8 Cal.3d 136, 146 [104 Cal.Rptr. 443, 501 P.2d 1163].)

- "A manufacturer is liable only when a defect in its product was a legal cause of injury. A tort is a legal cause of injury only when it is a substantial factor in producing the injury." (*Soule v. General Motors Corp.* (1972) 8 Cal.4th 548, 572 [34 Cal.Rptr.2d 607, 882 P.2d 298], internal citations omitted.)

- "[S]trict liability should not be imposed upon a manufacturer when injury results from a use of its product that is not reasonably foreseeable." (*Cronin*, *supra*, 8 Cal.3d at p. 126.)

- "[T]he plaintiff bears an initial burden of making 'a prima facie showing that the injury was proximately caused by the product's design.' This showing requires evidence that the plaintiff was injured while using the product in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner and that the plaintiff's ability to avoid injury was frustrated by the absence of a safety device, or by the nature of the product's design. If this prima facie burden is met, the burden of proof shifts to the defendant to prove, in light of the relevant factors, that the product is not defective. Importantly, the plaintiff's prima facie burden of producing evidence that injury occurred while the product was being used in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner must be distinguished from the ultimate burden of proof that rests with the defendant to establish that its product was not defective because the plaintiff's injury resulted from a misuse of the product." (*Perez*, *supra*, 188 Cal.App.4th at p. 678, internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

6 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, §§ 1428–1437

California Products Liability Actions, Ch. 2, *Liability for Defective Products*, § 2.11, Ch. 7, *Proof*, § 7.06 (Matthew Bender)

40 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 460, *Products Liability*, §§ 460.11, 460.30 (Matthew

Bender)

19 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 190, *Products Liability,* § 190.140 (Matthew Bender)

1203. Strict Liability—Design Defect—Consumer Expectation Test—Essential Factual Elements

---

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims the [***product***]'s design was defective because the [***product***] did not perform as safely as an ordinary consumer would have expected it to perform. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] [manufactured/distributed/sold] the [***product***];**

2. **That the [***product***] did not perform as safely as an ordinary consumer would have expected it to perform when used or misused in an intended or reasonably foreseeable way;**

3. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed ~~while using the [*product*] in a reasonably foreseeable way~~; and**

4. **That the [***product***]'s failure to perform safely was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

New September 2003; Revised December 2005, April 2009, December 2009, June 2011

Directions for Use

If both tests (the consumer expectation test and the risk-benefit test) for design defect are asserted by the plaintiff, the burden-of-proof instructions must make it clear that the two tests are alternatives. (*Bracisco v. Beech Aircraft Corp.* (1984) 159 Cal.App.3d 1101, 1106-1107 [206 Cal.Rptr. 431].)

The court must make an initial determination as to whether the consumer-expectation test applies to the product. In some cases, the court may determine that the product is one to which the test *may*, but not necessarily does, apply, leaving the determination to the jury. (See *Saller v. Crown Cork & Seal Co., Inc.* (2010) 187 Cal.App.4th 1220, 1233–1234 [115 Cal.Rptr.3d 151].) In such a case, modify the instruction to advise the jury that it must first determine whether the product is one about which an ordinary consumer can form reasonable minimum safety expectations.

To make a prima facie case, the plaintiff has the initial burden of producing evidence that he or she was injured while using the product in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner. If this prima facie burden is met, the burden of proof shifts to the defendant to prove that the plaintiff's injury resulted from a misuse of the product. (See *Perez v. VAS S.p.A.* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 658, 678 [115 Cal.Rptr.3d 590].) See also CACI No. 1245, *Affirmative Defense—Product Misuse or Modification.* Product misuse is a complete defense to strict products liability if the defendant proves that an unforeseeable abuse or alteration of the product after it left the manufacturer's hands was the sole or ~~reason~~ superseding cause of the plaintiff's ~~that the product caused~~ injury. (*Campbell v. Southern Pacific Co.* (1978) 22 Cal.3d 51, 56 [148 Cal.Rptr. 596, 583 P.2d 121]; see CACI No. 1245.) ~~See CACI No. 1245, *Affirmative Defense—Product Misuse or Modification.*~~ Misuse or modification that was a substantial factor in, but not the sole or superseding cause of, plaintiff's harm may also be considered in determining the comparative fault of

the plaintiff or of third persons. See CACI No. 1207A, *Strict Liability—Comparative Fault of Plaintiff*, and CACI No. 1207B, *Strict Liability—Comparative Fault of Third Person*.

Sources and Authority

- "A manufacturer, distributor, or retailer is liable in tort if a defect in the manufacture or design of its product causes injury while the product is being used in a reasonably foreseeable way." (*Soule v. General Motors Corp.* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 548, 560 [34 Cal.Rptr.2d 607, 882 P.2d 298].)

- "[A] product is defective in design either (1) if the product has failed to perform as safely as an ordinary consumer would expect when used in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner, or (2) if, in light of the relevant factors … , the benefits of the challenged design do not outweigh the risk of danger inherent in such design." (*Barker v. Lull Engineering* (1978) 20 Cal.3d 413, 418 [143 Cal.Rptr. 225, 573 P.2d 443]~~In *Barker v. Lull Engineering* (1978) 20 Cal.3d 413 [143 Cal.Rptr. 225, 573 P.2d 443], the court established two alternative tests for determining whether a product is defectively designed. Under the first test, a product may be found defective in design if the plaintiff demonstrates that the product "failed to perform as safely as an ordinary consumer would expect when used in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner." (*Id.* at p. 429.) Under the second test, a product is defective if the risk of danger inherent in the design outweighs the benefits of such design. (*Id.* at p. 430~~.)

- "The rationale of the consumer expectations test is that '[t]he purposes, behaviors, and dangers of certain products are commonly understood by those who ordinarily use them.' Therefore, in some cases, ordinary knowledge of the product's characteristics may permit an inference that the product did not perform as safely as it should. 'If the facts permit such a conclusion, and if the failure resulted from the product's design, a finding of defect is warranted without any further proof,' and the manufacturer may not defend by presenting expert evidence of a risk/benefit analysis. … Nonetheless, the inherent complexity of the product itself is not controlling on the issue of whether the consumer expectations test applies; a complex product 'may perform so unsafely that the defect is apparent to the common reason, experience, and understanding of its ordinary consumers.' (*Saller, supra*, 187 Cal.App.4th at p. 1232, internal citations omitted.)

- "Whether the jury should be instructed on either the consumer expectations test or the risk/benefit test depends upon the particular facts of the case. In a jury case, the trial court must initially determine as a question of foundation, within the context of the facts and circumstances of the particular case, whether the product is one about which the ordinary consumer can form reasonable minimum safety expectations. 'If the court concludes it is not, no consumer expectation instruction should be given. … If, on the other hand, the trial court finds there is sufficient evidence to support a finding that the ordinary consumer can form reasonable minimum safety expectations, the court should instruct the jury, consistent with Evidence Code section 403, subdivision (c), to determine whether the consumer expectation test applies to the product at issue in the circumstances of the case [or] to disregard the evidence about consumer expectations unless the jury finds that the test is applicable. If it finds the test applicable, the jury then must decide whether the product failed to perform as safely as an ordinary consumer would expect when the product is used in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner.' " (*Saller, supra*, 187 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1233–1234, internal citations omitted.)

- "[The] dual standard for design defect assures an injured plaintiff protection from products that either fall below ordinary consumer expectations as to safety or that, on balance, are not as safely designed as they should be." (*Barker, supra,* 20 Cal.3d at p. 418.)

- The consumer expectation test "acknowledges the relationship between strict tort liability for a defective product and the common law doctrine of warranty, which holds that a product's presence on the market includes an implied representation 'that it [will] safely do the jobs for which it was built.' " (*Soule, supra,* 8 Cal.4th at p. 562, internal citations omitted.)

- "[T]he jury may not be left free to find a violation of ordinary consumer expectations whenever it chooses. Unless the facts actually permit an inference that the product's performance did not meet the minimum safety expectations of its ordinary users, the jury must engage in the balancing of risks and benefits required by the second prong of *Barker*. Accordingly, as *Barker* indicated, instructions are misleading and incorrect if they allow a jury to avoid this risk-benefit analysis in a case where it is required." (*Soule, supra,* 8 Cal.4th at p. 568.)

- "[T]he consumer expectation test is reserved for cases in which the *everyday experience* of the product's users permits a conclusion that the product's design violated *minimum* safety assumptions, and is thus defective *regardless of expert opinion about the merits of the design*." (*Soule, supra,* 8 Cal.4th at p. 567, original italics.)

- "In determining whether a product's safety satisfies [the consumer expectation test], the jury considers the expectations of a hypothetical reasonable consumer, rather than those of the particular plaintiff in the case." (*Campbell v. General Motors Corp.* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 112, 126, fn. 6 [184 Cal.Rptr. 891, 649 P.2d 224].)

- State-of-the-art evidence is not relevant when the plaintiff relies on a consumer expectation theory of design defect. (*Morton v. Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.* (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 1529, 1536 [40 Cal.Rptr.2d 22].)

- "Where liability depends on the proof of a design defect, no practical difference exists between negligence and strict liability; the claims merge." (*Lambert v. General Motors* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 1179, 1185 [76 Cal.Rptr.2d 657].)

- " '[T]he law now requires a manufacturer to foresee some degree of misuse and abuse of his product, either by the user or by third parties, and to take reasonable precautions to minimize the harm that may result from misuse and abuse. … [T]he extent to which designers and manufacturers of dangerous machinery are required to anticipate safety neglect presents an issue of fact.' " (*Wright v. Stang Mfg. Co.* (1997) 54 Cal.App.4th 1218, 1235 [63 Cal.Rptr.2d 422].)

- "[T]he plaintiff bears an initial burden of making 'a prima facie showing that the injury was proximately caused by the product's design.' This showing requires evidence that the plaintiff was injured while using the product in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner and that the plaintiff's ability to avoid injury was frustrated by the absence of a safety device, or by the nature of the product's design. If this prima facie burden is met, the burden of proof shifts to the defendant to prove, in light of the relevant factors, that the product is not defective. Importantly, the plaintiff's

prima facie burden of producing evidence that injury occurred while the product was being used in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner must be distinguished from the ultimate burden of proof that rests with the defendant to establish that its product was not defective because the plaintiff's injury resulted from a misuse of the product." (*Perez, supra*, 188 Cal.App.4th at p. 678, internal citations omitted.)

- "The use of asbestos insulation is a product that is within the understanding of ordinary lay consumers. (*Saller, supra*, 187 Cal.App.4th at p. 1236.)

Secondary Sources

6 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, §§ 1449–1467

California Products Liability Actions, Ch. 2, *Liability for Defective Products*, § 2.11, Ch. 7, *Proof*, § 7.02 (Matthew Bender)

40 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 460, *Products Liability*, § 460.11 (Matthew Bender)

19 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 190, *Products Liability*, § 190.116 (Matthew Bender)

1204. Strict Liability—Design Defect—Risk-Benefit Test—Essential Factual Elements—Shifting Burden of Proof

---

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that the [***product***]'s design caused harm to [***name of plaintiff***]. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] [manufactured/distributed/sold] the [***product***];**

2. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed ~~while using the [*product*] in a reasonably foreseeable way~~; and**

3. **That the [***product***]'s design was a substantial factor in causing harm to [***name of plaintiff***].**

If [*name of plaintiff***] has proved these three facts, then your decision on this claim must be for [***name of plaintiff***] unless [***name of defendant***] proves that the benefits of the design outweigh the risks of the design. In deciding whether the benefits outweigh the risks, you should consider the following:**

(a) The gravity of the potential harm resulting from the use of the [*product***];**

(b) The likelihood that this harm would occur;

(c) The feasibility of an alternative safer design at the time of manufacture;

(d) The cost of an alternative design; [and]

(e) The disadvantages of an alternative design; [and]

(f) [*Other relevant factor(s)***].**

New September 2003; Revised February 2007, April 2009, December 2009, December 2010, June 2011

Directions for Use

If the plaintiff asserts both tests for design defect (the consumer expectation test and the risk-benefit test), the instructions must make it clear that the two tests are alternatives. (*Bracisco v. Beech Aircraft Corp.* (1984) 159 Cal.App.3d 1101, 1106–1107 [206 Cal.Rptr. 431].) Risk-benefit weighing is not a formal part of, nor may it serve as a defense to, the consumer expectations test. (*Bresnahan v. Chrysler Corp.* (1995) 32 Cal.App.4th 1559, 1569 [38 Cal.Rptr.2d 446].)

To make a prima facie case, the plaintiff has the initial burden of producing evidence that he or she was injured while using the product in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner. If this

prima facie burden is met, the burden of proof shifts to the defendant to prove that the plaintiff's injury resulted from a misuse of the product. (See *Perez v. VAS S.p.A.* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 658, 678 [115 Cal.Rptr.3d 590].) See also CACI No. 1245, *Affirmative Defense—Product Misuse or Modification.* Product misuse is a complete defense to strict products liability if the defendant proves that an unforeseeable abuse or alteration of the product after it left the manufacturer's hands was the sole or superseding cause of the plaintiff's ~~reason that the product caused~~ injury. (*Campbell v. Southern Pacific Co.* (1978) 22 Cal.3d 51, 56 [148 Cal.Rptr. 596, 583 P.2d 121]; see CACI No. 1245.) ~~See CACI No. 1245, *Affirmative Defense—Product Misuse or Modification.*~~ Misuse or modification that was a substantial factor in, but not the sole or superseding cause of, plaintiff's harm may also be considered in determining the comparative fault of the plaintiff or of third persons. See CACI No. 1207A, *Strict Liability—Comparative Fault of Plaintiff,* and CACI No. 1207B, *Strict Liability—Comparative Fault of Third Person.*

Aesthetics might be an additional factor to be considered in an appropriate case in which there is evidence that appearance is important in the marketability of the product. (See *Bell v. Bayerische Motoren Werke Aktiengesellschaft* (2010) 181 Cal.App.4th 1108, 1131 [105 Cal.Rptr.3d 485].)

Sources and Authority

- " '[O]nce the plaintiff makes a prima facie showing that the injury was proximately caused by the product's design, the burden should appropriately shift to the defendant to prove, in light of the relevant factors, that the product is not defective.' Appellants are therefore correct in asserting that it was not their burden to show that the risks involved in the loader's design—the lack of mechanical safety devices, or of a warning—outweighed the benefits of these aspects of its designs. The trial court's instruction to the jury, which quite likely would have been understood to place this burden on appellants, was therefore an error." (*Lunghi v. Clark Equipment Co., Inc.* (1984) 153 Cal.App.3d 485, 497–498 [200 Cal.Rptr. 387], internal citations omitted.).

- "[U]nder the risk/benefit test, the plaintiff may establish the product is defective by showing that its design proximately caused his injury and the defendant then fails to establish that on balance the benefits of the challenged design outweigh the risk of danger inherent in such design. In such case, the jury must evaluate the product's design by considering the gravity of the danger posed by the design, the likelihood such danger would occur, the feasibility of a safer alternative design, the financial cost of an improved design, and the adverse consequences to the consumer resulting from an alternative design. 'In such cases, the jury must consider the manufacturer's evidence of competing design considerations …, and the issue of design defect cannot fairly be resolved by standardless reference to the "expectations" of an "ordinary consumer." ' Once the plaintiff has made a prima facie showing that his or her injury was caused by the product's defective design, the burden shifts to the defendant to establish that, in light of the relevant factors, the product is not defective. (*Saller v. Crown Cork & Seal Co., Inc.* (2010) 187 Cal.App.4th 1220, 1233 [115 Cal.Rptr.3d 151], internal citations omitted.)

- "[T]he defendant's burden is one 'affecting the burden of proof, rather than simply the burden of producing evidence.' " (*Moreno v. Fey Manufacturing Corp.* (1983) 149 Cal.App.3d 23,

27 [196 Cal.Rptr. 487].)

- "Under *Barker*, in short, the plaintiff bears an initial burden of making 'a prima facie showing that the injury was proximately caused by the product's design. This showing requires evidence that the plaintiff was injured *while using the product in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner* and that the plaintiff's ability to avoid injury was frustrated by the absence of a safety device, or by the nature of the product's design. If this prima facie burden is met, the burden of proof shifts to the defendant to prove, in light of the relevant factors, that the product is not defective. Importantly, the plaintiff's prima facie burden of producing evidence that injury occurred while the product was being used in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner must be distinguished from the ultimate burden of proof that rests with the defendant to establish that its product was not defective because the plaintiff's injury resulted from a misuse of the product." (*Perez v. VAS S.p.A.* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 658, 678 ~~[___~~ [115 Cal.Rptr.3d ~~___],~~ 590], original italics, internal citations omitted.)

- " '[I]n evaluating the adequacy of a product's design pursuant to [the risk-benefit] standard, a jury may consider, among other relevant factors, the gravity of the danger posed by the challenged design, the likelihood that such danger would occur, the mechanical feasibility of a safer alternative design, the financial cost of an improved design, and the adverse consequences to the product and to the consumer that would result from an alternative design.' ~~'[O]nce the plaintiff makes a prima facie showing that the injury was proximately caused by the product's design, the burden should appropriately shift to the defendant to prove, in light of the relevant factors, that the product is not defective.'~~ " (*Gonzalez v. Autoliv ASP, Inc.* (2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 780, 786–787 [64 Cal.Rptr.3d 908], internal citations omitted.)

- "Plaintiffs contend aesthetics is not a proper consideration in the risk-benefit analysis, and the trial court's ruling to the contrary was an '[e]rror in law.' We disagree. In our view, much of the perceived benefit of a car lies in its appearance. A car is not a strictly utilitarian product. We believe that a jury properly may consider aesthetics in balancing the benefits of a challenged design against the risk of danger inherent in the design. Although consideration of the disadvantages of an alternative design (CACI No. 1204, factor (e)) would encompass any impact on aesthetics, we conclude that there was no error in the trial court's approval of the modification listing aesthetics as a relevant factor." (*Bell, supra,* 181 Cal.App.4th at p. 1131, internal citations omitted.)

- "Taken together, section 2, subdivision (b), and section 5 of the Restatement indicate that a component part manufacturer may be held liable for a defect in the component. When viewed in its entirety, the Restatement does not support [defendant]'s argument that '[o]nly if the component part analysis establishes sufficient control over the design of the alleged defect should the component manufacturer be held to the standard of the risk-benefit test.' Instead, the test considering foreseeable risks of harm and alternative designs is applied to the component part manufacturer when the alleged defect is in the component." (*Gonzalez, supra,* 154 Cal.App.4th at pp. 789–790.)

- "Where liability depends on the proof of a design defect, no practical difference exists

between negligence and strict liability; the claims merge." (*Lambert v. General Motors* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 1179, 1185 [76 Cal.Rptr.2d 657].)

Secondary Sources

6 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, §§ 1449–1467

California Products Liability Actions, Ch. 7, *Proof*, § 7.02 (Matthew Bender)

40 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 460, *Products Liability*, § 460.11 (Matthew Bender)

19 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 190, *Products Liability*, §§ 190.110, 190.118–190.122 (Matthew Bender)

1205. Strict Liability—Failure to Warn—Essential Factual Elements

---

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that the [***product***] lacked sufficient [instructions] [or] [warning of potential [risks/side effects/allergic reactions]]. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] [manufactured/distributed/sold] the [***product***];**

2. **That the [***product***] had potential [risks/side effects/allergic reactions] that were [known] [or] [knowable by the use of scientific knowledge available] at the time of [manufacture/distribution/sale];**

3. **That the potential [risks/side effects/allergic reactions] presented a substantial danger to ~~users of~~persons using or misusing the [***product***] in an intended or reasonably foreseeable way;**

4. **That ordinary consumers would not have recognized the potential [risks/side effects/allergic reactions];**

5. **That [***name of defendant***] failed to adequately warn [or instruct] of the potential [risks/side effects/allergic reactions];**

6. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed ~~while using the [*product*] in a reasonably foreseeable way~~; and**

7. **That the lack of sufficient [instructions] [or] [warnings] was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

[The warning must be given to the prescribing physician and must include the potential risks, side effects, or allergic reactions that may follow the foreseeable use of the product. [*Name of defendant***] had a continuing duty to warn physicians as long as the product was in use.]**

New September 2003; Revised April 2009, December 2009, June 2011

Directions for Use

A fuller definition of "scientific knowledge" may be appropriate in certain cases. Such a definition would advise that the defendant did not adequately warn of a potential risk, side effect, or allergic reaction that was "knowable in light of the generally recognized and prevailing best scientific and medical knowledge available." (*Carlin v. Superior Court* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 1104, 1112 [56 Cal.Rptr.2d 162, 920 P.2d 1347].)

The last bracketed paragraph should be read only in prescription product cases: "In the case of prescription drugs and implants, the physician stands in the shoes of the 'ordinary user' because it is through the physician that a patient learns of the properties and proper use of the drug or implant. Thus,

the duty to warn in these cases runs to the physician, not the patient." (*Valentine v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.* (1999) 68 Cal.App.4th 1467, 1483 [81 Cal.Rptr.2d 252].)

To make a prima facie case, the plaintiff has the initial burden of producing evidence that he or she was injured while using the product in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner. If this prima facie burden is met, the burden of proof shifts to the defendant to prove that the plaintiff's injury resulted from a misuse of the product. (See *Perez v. VAS S.p.A.* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 658, 678 [115 Cal.Rptr.3d 590].) See also CACI No. 1245, *Affirmative Defense—Product Misuse or Modification.* Product misuse is a complete defense to strict products liability if the defendant proves that an unforeseeable abuse or alteration of the product after it left the manufacturer's hands was the sole or superseding cause of the plaintiff's ~~reason that the product caused~~ injury. (*Campbell v. Southern Pacific Co.* (1978) 22 Cal.3d 51, 56 [148 Cal.Rptr. 596, 583 P.2d 121]; see CACI No. 1245.) ~~See CACI No. 1245, *Affirmative Defense—Product Misuse or Modification.*~~ Misuse or modification that was a substantial factor in, but not the sole or superseding cause of, plaintiff's harm may also be considered in determining the comparative fault of the plaintiff or of third persons. See CACI No. 1207A, *Strict Liability—Comparative Fault of Plaintiff,* and CACI No. 1207B, *Strict Liability—Comparative Fault of Third Person*.

Sources and Authority

- "Our law recognizes that even ' "a product flawlessly designed and produced may nevertheless possess such risks to the user without a suitable warning that it becomes 'defective' simply by the absence of a warning." …' Thus, manufacturers have a duty to warn consumers about the hazards inherent in their products. The purpose of requiring adequate warnings is to inform consumers about a product's hazards and faults of which they are unaware, so that the consumer may then either refrain from using the product altogether or avoid the danger by careful use." (*Taylor v. Elliott Turbomachinery Co., Inc.* (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 564, 577 [90 Cal.Rptr.3d 414], internal citations and footnote omitted.)

- "Negligence and strict products liability are separate and distinct bases for liability that do not automatically collapse into each other because the plaintiff might allege both when a product warning contributes to her injury." (*Conte v. Wyeth, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 89, 101 [85 Cal.Rptr.3d 299].)

- "[F]ailure to warn in strict liability differs markedly from failure to warn in the negligence context. Negligence law in a failure-to-warn case requires a plaintiff to prove that a manufacturer or distributor did not warn of a particular risk for reasons which fell below the acceptable standard of care, i.e., what a reasonably prudent manufacturer would have known and warned about. Strict liability is not concerned with the standard of due care or the reasonableness of a manufacturer's conduct. The rules of strict liability require a plaintiff to prove only that the defendant did not adequately warn of a particular risk that was known or knowable in light of the generally recognized and prevailing best scientific and medical knowledge available at the time of manufacture and distribution. ... [¶] [T]he manufacturer is liable if it failed to give warning of dangers that were known to the scientific community at the time it manufactured or distributed the product. Thus, in strict liability, as opposed to negligence, the reasonableness of the defendant's failure to warn is immaterial." (*Anderson v. Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 987, 1002-1003 [281 Cal.Rptr. 528, 810 P.2d 549].)

- "It is true that the two types of failure to warn claims are not necessarily exclusive: 'No valid reason appears to require a plaintiff to elect whether to proceed on the theory of strict liability in tort or on the theory of negligence. … [¶] Nor does it appear that instructions on the two theories will be confusing to the jury. There is nothing inconsistent in instructions on the two theories and to a large extent the two theories parallel and supplement each other.' Despite the often significant overlap between the theories of negligence and strict liability based on a product defect, a plaintiff is entitled to instructions on both theories if both are supported by the evidence." (*Oxford v. Foster Wheeler LLC* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 700, 717 [99 Cal.Rptr.3d 418].)

- "The actual knowledge of the individual manufacturer, even if reasonably prudent, is not the issue. We view the standard to require that the manufacturer is held to the knowledge and skill of an expert in the field; it is obliged to keep abreast of any scientific discoveries and is presumed to know the results of all such advances." (*Carlin, supra,* 13 Cal.4th at p. 1113, fn. 3.)

- "[A] defendant in a strict products liability action based upon an alleged failure to warn of a risk of harm may present evidence of the state of the art, i.e., evidence that the particular risk was neither known nor knowable by the application of scientific knowledge available at the time of manufacture and/or distribution." (*Anderson, supra,* 53 Cal.3d at p. 1004.)

- "[T]here can be no liability for failure to warn where the instructions or warnings sufficiently alert the user to the possibility of danger." (*Aguayo v. Crompton & Knowles Corp.* (1986) 183 Cal.App.3d 1032, 1042 [228 Cal.Rptr. 768], internal citation omitted.)

- "A duty to warn or disclose danger arises when an article is or should be known to be dangerous for its intended use, either inherently or because of defects." (*DeLeon v. Commercial Manufacturing and Supply Co.* (1983) 148 Cal.App.3d 336, 343 [195 Cal.Rptr. 867], internal citation omitted.)

- "... California is well settled into the majority view that knowledge, actual or constructive, is a requisite for strict liability for failure to warn ... ." (*Anderson, supra,* 53 Cal.3d at p. 1000.)

- "[T]he duty to warn is not conditioned upon [actual or constructive] knowledge [of a danger] where the defectiveness of a product depends on the adequacy of instructions furnished by the supplier which are essential to the assembly and use of its product." (*Midgley v. S. S. Kresge Co.* (1976) 55 Cal.App.3d 67, 74 [127 Cal.Rptr. 217].)

- Under *Cronin,* plaintiffs in cases involving manufacturing and design defects do not have to prove that a defect made a product unreasonably dangerous; however, that case "did not preclude weighing the degree of dangerousness in the failure to warn cases." (*Cavers v. Cushman Motor Sales, Inc.* (1979) 95 Cal.App.3d 338, 343 [157 Cal.Rptr. 142].)

- "[T]he warning requirement is not limited to unreasonably or unavoidably dangerous products. Rather, directions or warnings are in order where reasonably required *to prevent the use of a product from becoming unreasonably dangerous*. It is the lack of such a warning which renders a product unreasonably dangerous and therefore defective." (*Gonzales v. Carmenita Ford Truck Sales, Inc.* (1987) 192 Cal.App.3d 1143, 1151 [238 Cal.Rptr. 18], original italics.)

- "In most cases, ... the adequacy of a warning is a question of fact for the jury." (*Jackson v. Deft, Inc.* (1990) 223 Cal.App.3d 1305, 1320 [273 Cal.Rptr. 214].)

- "[A] pharmaceutical manufacturer may not be required to provide warning of a risk known to the medical community." (*Carlin, supra,* 13 Cal.4th at p. 1116.)

- "To be liable in California, even under a strict liability theory, the plaintiff must prove that the defendant's failure to warn was a substantial factor in causing his or her injury. (CACI No. 1205.) The natural corollary to this requirement is that a defendant is not liable to a plaintiff if the injury would have occurred even if the defendant had issued adequate warnings." (*Huitt v. Southern California Gas Co.* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 1586, 1604 [116 Cal.Rptr.3d 453].)

- "[A] manufacturer's liability to the ultimate consumer may be extinguished by 'intervening cause' where the manufacturer either provides adequate warnings to a middleman or the middleman alters the product before passing it to the final consumer." (*Garza v. Asbestos Corp., Ltd.* (2008) 161 Cal.App.4th 651, 661 [74 Cal.Rptr.3d 359].)

- " 'A manufacturer's duty to warn is a continuous duty which lasts as long as the product is in use.' ... [T]he manufacturer must continue to provide physicians with warnings, at least so long as it is manufacturing and distributing the product." (*Valentine, supra,* 68 Cal.App.4th at p. 1482.)

- " '[T]he law now requires a manufacturer to foresee some degree of misuse and abuse of his product, either by the user or by third parties, and to take reasonable precautions to minimize the harm that may result from misuse and abuse. … [T]he extent to which designers and manufacturers of dangerous machinery are required to anticipate safety neglect presents an issue of fact. … [A] manufacturer owes a foreseeable user of its product a duty to warn of risks of using the product.' " (*Wright v. Stang Mfg. Co.* (1997) 54 Cal.App.4th 1218, 1235 [63 Cal.Rptr.2d 422].)

- "California case law has not imposed on manufacturers a duty to warn about the dangerous propensities of other manufacturers' products. California courts will not impose a duty to warn on a manufacturer where the manufacturer's product 'did not cause or create the risk of harm.' As one commentary explains, '[t]he product must, in some sense of the word, "create" the risk. If it does not, then the manufacturer should not be required to supply warnings, even if the risks are not obvious to users and consumers.' As California law now stands, unless the manufacturer's product in some way causes or creates the risk of harm, 'the risks of the manufacturer's own product … are the only risks [the manufacturer] is required to know.' " (*Taylor, supra,* 171 Cal.App.4th at p. 583, internal citations omitted.)

- ~~"[T]he law now requires a manufacturer to foresee some degree of misuse and abuse of his product, either by the user or by third parties, and to take reasonable precautions to minimize the harm that may result from misuse and abuse." (*Self v. General Motors Corp.* (1974) 42 Cal.App.3d 1, 7 [116 Cal.Rptr. 575], disapproved and overruled on another issue in *Soule v. GM Corp.* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 548, 580 [34 Cal.Rptr.2d 607, 882 P.2d 298].)~~

- "[T]he plaintiff bears an initial burden of making 'a prima facie showing that the injury was

proximately caused by the product's design.' This showing requires evidence that the plaintiff was injured while using the product in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner and that the plaintiff's ability to avoid injury was frustrated by the absence of a safety device, or by the nature of the product's design. If this prima facie burden is met, the burden of proof shifts to the defendant to prove, in light of the relevant factors, that the product is not defective. Importantly, the plaintiff's prima facie burden of producing evidence that injury occurred while the product was being used in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner must be distinguished from the ultimate burden of proof that rests with the defendant to establish that its product was not defective because the plaintiff's injury resulted from a misuse of the product." (*Perez, supra*, 188 Cal.App.4th at p. 678, internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

6 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, §§ 1467–1479

California Products Liability Actions, Ch. 2, *Liability for Defective Products*, § 2.11, Ch. 7, *Proof*, § 7.05 (Matthew Bender)

40 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 460, *Products Liability*, §§ 460.11, 460.164 (Matthew Bender)

19 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 190, *Products Liability*, § 190.194 (Matthew Bender)

1222. Negligence—Manufacturer or Supplier—Duty to Warn—Essential Factual Elements

---

[*Name of plaintiff*] claims that [*name of defendant*] was negligent by not using reasonable care to warn [or instruct] about the [*product*]'s dangerous condition or about facts that make the [*product*] likely to be dangerous. To establish this claim, [*name of plaintiff*] must prove all of the following:

1. **That [*name of defendant*] [manufactured/distributed/sold] the [*product*];**

2. **That [*name of defendant*] knew or reasonably should have known that the [*product*] was dangerous or was likely to be dangerous when used or misused in a reasonably foreseeable manner;**

3. **That [*name of defendant*] knew or reasonably should have known that users would not realize the danger;**

4. **That [*name of defendant*] failed to adequately warn of the danger [or instruct on the safe use of the [*product*]];**

5. **That a reasonable [manufacturer/distributor/seller] under the same or similar circumstances would have warned of the danger [or instructed on the safe use of the [*product*]];**

6. **That [*name of plaintiff*] was harmed; and**

7. **That [*name of defendant*]'s failure to warn [or instruct] was a substantial factor in causing [*name of plaintiff*]'s harm.**

[The warning must be given to the prescribing physician and must include the potential risks or side effects that may follow the foreseeable use of the product. [*Name of defendant*] had a continuing duty to warn physicians as long as the product was in use.]

New September 2003; Revised June 2011

Directions for Use

To make a prima facie case, the plaintiff has the initial burden of producing evidence that he or she was injured while using the product in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner. If this prima facie burden is met, the burden of proof shifts to the defendant to prove that the plaintiff's injury resulted from a misuse of the product. (See *Perez v. VAS S.p.A.* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 658, 678 [115 Cal.Rptr.3d 590].) See also CACI No. 1245, *Affirmative Defense—Product Misuse or Modification*. Product misuse is a complete defense to strict products liability if the defendant proves that an unforeseeable abuse or alteration of the product after it left the manufacturer's hands was the sole or superseding cause of the plaintiff's injury. (*Campbell v. Southern Pacific Co.* (1978) 22 Cal.3d 51, 56 [148 Cal.Rptr. 596, 583 P.2d 121]; see CACI No. 1245.) Misuse or modification that was a substantial factor in, but not the sole

or superseding cause of, plaintiff's harm may also be considered in determining the comparative fault of the plaintiff or of third persons. See CACI No. 1207A, *Strict Liability—Comparative Fault of Plaintiff*, and CACI No. 1207B, *Strict Liability—Comparative Fault of Third Person*.

The last bracketed paragraph is to be used in prescription drug cases only.

Sources and Authority

- ~~A manufacturer~~ "[T]he manufacturer has a duty to use reasonable care to give warning of the dangerous condition of the product or of facts which make it likely to be dangerous to those whom he should expect to use the product or be endangered by its probable use, if the manufacturer has reason to believe that they will not realize its dangerous condition." (*Putensen v. Clay Adams, Inc.* (1970) 12 Cal.App.3d 1062, 1076-1077 [91 Cal.Rptr. 319].)

- "Negligence and strict products liability are separate and distinct bases for liability that do not automatically collapse into each other because the plaintiff might allege both when a product warning contributes to her injury." (*Conte v. Wyeth, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 89, 101 [85 Cal.Rptr.3d 299].)

- "[F]ailure to warn in strict liability differs markedly from failure to warn in the negligence context. Negligence law in a failure-to-warn case requires a plaintiff to prove that a manufacturer or distributor did not warn of a particular risk for reasons which fell below the acceptable standard of care, i.e., what a reasonably prudent manufacturer would have known and warned about. Strict liability is not concerned with the standard of due care or the reasonableness of a manufacturer's conduct. The rules of strict liability require a plaintiff to prove only that the defendant did not adequately warn of a particular risk that was known or knowable in light of the generally recognized and prevailing best scientific and medical knowledge available at the time of manufacture and distribution. Thus, in strict liability, as opposed to negligence, the reasonableness of the defendant's failure to warn is immaterial." (*Anderson v. Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 987, 1002 [281 Cal.Rptr. 528, 810 P.2d 549].)

- "It is true that the two types of failure to warn claims are not necessarily exclusive: 'No valid reason appears to require a plaintiff to elect whether to proceed on the theory of strict liability in tort or on the theory of negligence. … [¶] Nor does it appear that instructions on the two theories will be confusing to the jury. There is nothing inconsistent in instructions on the two theories and to a large extent the two theories parallel and supplement each other.' Despite the often significant overlap between the theories of negligence and strict liability based on a product defect, a plaintiff is entitled to instructions on both theories if both are supported by the evidence." (*Oxford v. Foster Wheeler LLC* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 700, 717 [99 Cal.Rptr.3d 418].)

- ~~Restatement Second of Torts section 388 provides:~~

  ~~One who supplies directly or through a third person a chattel for another to use is subject to liability to those whom the supplier should expect to use the chattel with the consent of the other or to be endangered by its probable use, for physical harm caused by the use of the chattel in the manner for which and by a person for whose use it is supplied, if the supplier~~

~~(a) knows or has reason to know that the chattel is or is likely to be dangerous for the use for which it is supplied, and~~

~~(b) has no reason to believe that those for whose use the chattel is supplied will realize its dangerous condition, and~~

~~(c) fails to exercise reasonable care to inform them of its dangerous condition or of the facts which make it likely to be dangerous.~~

- ~~Restatement Second of Torts section 394 provides: "The manufacturer of a chattel which he knows or has reason to know to be, or to be likely to be, dangerous for use is subject to the liability of a supplier of chattels with such knowledge."~~

- ~~These sections have been cited with approval by California courts. (See *Putensen, supra*, 12 Cal.App.3d at p. 1077 and cases cited therein.)~~

- There is no duty to warn of obvious defects. (*Krawitz v. Rusch* (1989) 209 Cal.App.3d 957, 966 [257 Cal.Rptr. 610]; *Holmes v. J.C. Penney Co.* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 216, 220 [183 Cal.Rptr. 777]; *Morris v. Toy Box* (1962) 204 Cal.App.2d 468, 471 [22 Cal.Rptr. 572].)

- "When a manufacturer or distributor has no effective way to convey a product warning to the ultimate consumer, the manufacturer should be permitted to rely on downstream suppliers to provide the warning. 'Modern life would be intolerable unless one were permitted to rely to a certain extent on others doing what they normally do, particularly if it is their duty to do so.' " (*Persons v. Salomon N. Am.* (1990) 217 Cal.App.3d 168, 178 [265 Cal.Rptr. 773], internal citation omitted.)

- The duty of a manufacturer to warn about the potential hazards of its product, even when that product is only a component of an item manufactured or assembled by a third party, has been recognized, but is limited. (See *Garza v. Asbestos Corp., Ltd.* (2008) 161 Cal.App.4th 651, 661 [74 Cal.Rptr.3d 359]; *Artiglio v. General Electric Co.* (1998) 61 Cal.App.4th 830, 837 [71 Cal.Rptr.2d 817].)

- "[T]he plaintiff bears an initial burden of making 'a prima facie showing that the injury was proximately caused by the product's design.' This showing requires evidence that the plaintiff was injured while using the product in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner and that the plaintiff's ability to avoid injury was frustrated by the absence of a safety device, or by the nature of the product's design. If this prima facie burden is met, the burden of proof shifts to the defendant to prove, in light of the relevant factors, that the product is not defective. Importantly, the plaintiff's prima facie burden of producing evidence that injury occurred while the product was being used in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner must be distinguished from the ultimate burden of proof that rests with the defendant to establish that its product was not defective because the plaintiff's injury resulted from a misuse of the product." (*Perez, supra*, 188 Cal.App.4th at p. 678, internal citations omitted.)

- Restatement Third of Torts, Products Liability, section 2 provides in part:

A product is defective when, at the time of sale or distribution, it contains a manufacturing defect, is defective in design, or is defective because of inadequate instructions or warnings. A product:

…

(c) is defective because of inadequate instructions or warnings when the foreseeable risks of harm posed by the product could have been reduced or avoided by the provision of reasonable instructions or warnings by the seller or other distributor, or a predecessor in the commercial chain of distribution, and the omission of the instructions or warnings renders the product not reasonably safe.

Comment m provides: "Reasonably foreseeable uses and risks in design and warning claims. Subsections (b) and (c) impose liability only when the product is put to uses that it is reasonable to expect a seller or distributor to foresee. Product sellers and distributors are not required to foresee and take precautions against every conceivable mode of use and abuse to which their products might be put. Increasing the costs of designing and marketing products in order to avoid the consequences of unreasonable modes of use is not required."

Secondary Sources

California Products Liability Actions, Ch. 2, *Liability for Defective Products*, § 2.21, Ch. 7, *Proof*, § 7.05 (Matthew Bender)

40 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 460, *Products Liability*, § 460.11 (Matthew Bender)

19 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 190, *Products Liability*, § 190.165 et seq. (Matthew Bender)

1245. Affirmative Defense—Product Misuse or Modification

[*Name of defendant***] claims that [he/she/it] is not responsible for [***name of plaintiff***]'s claimed harm because the [***product***] was [misused/ [or] modified] after it left [***name of defendant***]'s possession. To succeed on this defense, [***name of defendant***] must prove that:**

1. **The [***product***] was [misused/ [or] modified] after it left [***name of defendant***]'s possession;**

2. **That the [misuse/ [or] modification] was not reasonably foreseeable to [***name of defendant***]; and**

3. **That the [misuse/ [or] modification] was the sole or superseding cause of [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

To establish a superseding cause, [*name of defendant***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That a reasonable person would consider [***name of plaintiff/name of third person***]'s [misuse/ [or] modification] of the [product] to be highly unusual;**

2. **That [***name of defendant***] did not know and had no reason to expect that [***name of plaintiff/name of third person***] would [misuse / [or] modify] the [product] in that manner; and**

3 **That the kind of harm resulting from [***name of plaintiff/name of third person***]'s [misuse/ [or] modification] was different from the kind of harm that could have been reasonably expected.**

New April 2009; Revised December 2009, June 2011

Directions for Use

Give this instruction if the defendant claims a complete defense to strict product liability because the product was misused or modified after it left the defendant's possession and control, and the subsequent misuse or modification was so unforeseeable that it should be deemed the sole or superseding cause. If misuse or modification was a substantial factor contributing to, but not the sole or superseding cause of, plaintiff's harm, there is no complete defense, but the conduct of the plaintiff or of third parties may be considered under principles of comparative negligence or fault. (See *Torres v. Xomox Corp.* (1996) 49 Cal.App.4th 1, 15–21 [56 Cal.Rptr.2d 455].) See CACI No. 1207A, *Strict Liability—Comparative Fault of Plaintiff,* and CACI No. 1207B, *Strict Liability—Comparative Fault of Third Person.*

Sources and Authority

- " '[T]he law now requires a manufacturer to foresee some degree of misuse and abuse of his product, either by the user or by third parties, and to take reasonable precautions to minimize the harm that

may result from misuse and abuse. … [T]he extent to which designers and manufacturers of dangerous machinery are required to anticipate safety neglect presents an issue of fact. … [A] manufacturer owes a foreseeable user of its product a duty to warn of risks of using the product.' " (*Wright v. Stang Mfg. Co.* (1997) 54 Cal.App.4th 1218, 1235 [63 Cal.Rptr.2d 422].)

- "[P]roduct misuse [is] a defense to strict products liability only when the defendant prove[s] that an unforeseeable abuse or alteration of the product after it left the manufacturer's hands was the *sole* reason that the product caused injury." (*Campbell v. Southern Pacific Co.* (1978) 22 Cal.3d 51, 56 [148 Cal.Rptr. 596, 583 P.2d 121], original italics, internal citations omitted.)

- "[S]trict liability should not be imposed upon a manufacturer when injury results from a use of its product that is not reasonably foreseeable." (*Cronin v. J.B.E. Olson Corp.* (1972) 8 Cal.3d 121, 126 [104 Cal.Rptr. 433, 501 P.2d 1153].)

- "[Defendant] contends … that it cannot be held liable for any design defect because the accident was attributable to the misuse of the rewinder by [employer] and [plaintiff]. In order to avoid liability for product defect, [defendant] was required to prove, as an affirmative defense, that [employer]'s and [plaintiff]'s misuse of the machine … was an unforeseeable, superseding cause of the injury to [plaintiff]." *Perez v. VAS S.p.A.* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 658, 679–680 [___ Cal.Rptr.3d ___].)

- "[P]roduct misuse may serve as a complete defense when the misuse 'was so unforeseeable that it should be deemed the sole *or* superseding cause.' … '[T]he defense of "superseding cause …" … absolves a tortfeasor, *even though his [or her] conduct was a substantial contributing factor*, when an independent event intervenes in the chain of causation, producing harm of a kind and degree so far beyond the risk the original tortfeasor should have foreseen that the law deems it unfair to hold him responsible. [Citations.]' Here, the trial court reasonably concluded, in substance, that [plaintiff]'s misuse of the rewinder was so extreme as to be the sole cause of his injury. That conclusion dispensed with the need to apply principles of comparative fault." (*Perez, supra*, 188 Cal.App.4th at p. 685, original italics.)

- " 'Misuse' is a defense only when that misuse is the actual cause of the plaintiff's injury, not when some other defect produces the harm. This causation is one of the elements of the 'misuse' affirmative defense and thus the burden falls on the defendant to prove it." (*Huynh v. Ingersoll-Rand* (1993) 16 Cal.App.4th 825, 831 [20 Cal.Rptr.2d 296], internal citation omitted.)

- "[Defendant] further contends that [plaintiff]'s injuries arose not from a defective product, but rather, from his parents' modification of the product or their negligent supervision of its use. These arguments cannot be advanced by demurrer. Creation of an unreasonable risk of harm through product modification or negligent supervision is not clearly established on the face of [plaintiff]'s complaint. Instead, these theories must be pled as affirmative defenses." (*Williams v. Beechnut Nutrition Corp.* (1986) 185 Cal.App.3d 135, 141 [229 Cal.Rptr. 605].)

- "[T]here are cases in which the modification of a product has been determined to be so substantial and unforeseeable as to constitute a superseding cause of an injury as a matter of law. However, foreseeability is a question for the jury unless undisputed facts leave no room for a reasonable difference of opinion. Thus, the issue of superseding cause is generally one of fact. Superseding

cause has been viewed as an issue of fact even in cases where 'safety neglect' by an employer has increased the risk of injury, or modification of the product has made it more dangerous." (*Torres, supra,* 49 Cal.App.4th at p. 19, internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, § 1530

California Product Liability Actions, Ch. 2, *Liability for Defective Products*, § 2.13[4] (Matthew Bender)

40 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 460, *Products Liability*, § 460.183 (Matthew Bender)

19 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 190, *Products Liability*, § 190.201 (Matthew Bender)

2570. Age Discrimination—Disparate Treatment—Essential Factual Elements

---

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] wrongfully discriminated against [him/her] because of [his/her] age. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of defendant***] was [an employer/[***other covered entity***]];**

2. **That [***name of plaintiff***] [was an employee of [***name of defendant***]/applied to [***name of defendant***] for a job/[***describe other covered relationship to defendant***]];**

3. **That [***name of defendant***] [discharged/refused to hire/[***other adverse employment action***]] [***name of plaintiff***];**

4. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was age 40 or older at the time of the [discharge/[***other adverse employment action***]];]**

5. **That [***name of plaintiff***]'s age was a motivating reason for the [discharge/refusal to hire/[***other adverse employment action***]];**

6. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

7. **That the [**discharge/refusal to hire/[***other adverse employment action***]] was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

New June 2011

Directions for Use

Give also CACI No. 2507, *"Motivating Reason" Explained.* See also the Sources and Authority to CACI No, 2500, *Disparate Treatment—Essential Factual Elements.*

Note that there are two causation elements. There must be a causal link between the discriminatory animus based on age and the adverse action (see element 5), and there must be a causal link between the adverse action and the damage (see element 7). (See *Mamou v. Trendwest Resorts, Inc.* (2008) 165 Cal.App.4th 686, 713 [81 Cal.Rptr.3d 406].)

Under the *McDonnell Douglas* (*McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green* (1973) 411 U.S. 792 [93 S.Ct. 1817, 36 L.Ed.2d 668]) process for allocating burdens of proof and producing evidence, which is used in California for disparate-treatment cases under FEHA, the employee must first present a prima facie case of discrimination. The burden then shifts to the employer to produce evidence of a nondiscriminatory reason for the adverse action. At that point, the burden shifts back to the employee to show that the employer's stated reason was in fact a pretext for a discriminatory act.

Whether or not the employee has met his or her prima facie burden, and whether or not the employer has

rebutted the employee's prima facie showing, are questions of law for the trial court, not questions of fact for the jury. (See *Caldwell v. Paramount Unified School Dist.* (1995) 41 Cal.App.4th 189, 201 [48 Cal.Rptr.2d 448].) In other words, by the time that the case is submitted to the jury, the plaintiff has already established his or her prima facie case, and the employer has already proffered a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for the adverse employment decision. The *McDonnell Douglas* shifting burden drops from the case. The jury is left to decide which evidence it finds more convincing, that of the employer's discriminatory intent, or that of the employer's age-neutral reasons for the employment decision. (See *Muzquiz v. City of Emeryville* (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 1106, 1118, fn. 5 [94 Cal.Rptr.2d 579]).

Under FEHA, age-discrimination cases require the employee to show that his or her job performance was satisfactory at the time of the adverse employment action as a part of his or her prima facie case (see *Sandell v. Taylor-Listug, Inc.* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 297, 321 [115 Cal.Rptr.3d 453]), even though it is the employer's burden to produce evidence of a nondiscriminatory reason for the action. Poor job performance is the most common nondiscriminatory reason that an employer advances for the action. Even though satisfactory job performance may be an element of the employee's prima facie case, it is not an element that the employee must prove to the trier of fact. Under element 5 and CACI No. 2507, the burden remains with the employee to ultimately prove that age discrimination was a motivating reason for the action. (See *Muzquiz, supra,* 79 Cal.App.4th at p. 1119.)

Sources and Authority

- Government Code section 12940(a) provides that it is an unlawful employment practice "[f]or an employer, because of the race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, marital status, sex, *age,* or sexual orientation of any person, to refuse to hire or employ the person or to refuse to select the person for a training program leading to employment, or to bar or to discharge the person from employment or from a training program leading to employment, or to discriminate against the person in compensation or in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment." (emphasis added)

- Government Code section 12926(b) provides that " 'Age' refers to the chronological age of any individual who has reached his or her 40th birthday."

- Government Code section 12941 provides:

  The Legislature hereby declares its rejection of the court of appeal opinion in *Marks v Loral Corp.* (1997) 57 Cal. App.4th 30, and states that the opinion does not affect existing law in any way, including, but not limited to, the law pertaining to disparate treatment. The Legislature declares its intent that the use of salary as the basis for differentiating between employees when terminating employment may be found to constitute age discrimination if use of that criterion adversely impacts older workers as a group, and further declares its intent that the disparate impact theory of proof may be used in claims of age discrimination. The Legislature further reaffirms and declares its intent that the courts interpret the state's statutes prohibiting age discrimination in employment broadly and vigorously, in a manner comparable to prohibitions against sex and race discrimination, and with the goal of not only protecting older workers as individuals, but also of protecting older workers as a group, since they face unique obstacles in the later phases of their

careers. Nothing in this section shall limit the affirmative defenses traditionally available in employment discrimination cases including, but not limited to, those set forth in Section 7286.7 of Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations.

- "In order to make out a prima facie case of age discrimination under FEHA, a plaintiff must present evidence that the plaintiff (1) is over the age of 40; (2) suffered an adverse employment action; (3) was performing satisfactorily at the time of the adverse action; and (4) suffered the adverse action under circumstances that give rise to an inference of unlawful discrimination, i.e., evidence that the plaintiff was replaced by someone significantly younger than the plaintiff. " (*Sandell, supra,* 188 Cal.App.4th at p. 321.)

- "In other words, '[b]y the time that the case is submitted to the jury, . . . the plaintiff has already established his or her prima facie case, and the employer has already proffered a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for the adverse employment decision, leaving only the issue of the employer's discriminatory intent for resolution by the trier of fact. Otherwise, the case would have been disposed of as a matter of law for the trial court. That is to say, if the plaintiff cannot make out a prima facie case, the employer wins as a matter of law. If the employer cannot articulate a nondiscriminatory reason for the adverse employment decision, the plaintiff wins as a matter of law. In those instances, no fact-finding is required, and the case will never reach a jury. [P] In short, if and when the case is submitted to the jury, the construct of the shifting burden "drops from the case," and the jury is left to decide which evidence it finds more convincing, that of the employer's discriminatory intent, or that of the employer's raceor age-neutral reasons for the employment decision.' " (*Muzquiz, supra,* 79 Cal.App.4th at p. 1118, fn. 5.)

- "Because the only issue properly before the trier of fact was whether the [defendant]'s adverse employment decision was motivated by discrimination on the basis of age, the shifting burdens of proof regarding appellant's prima facie case and the issue of legitimate nondiscriminatory grounds were actually irrelevant." (*Muzquiz, supra,* 79 Cal.App.4th at p. 1119.)

- "An employee alleging age discrimination must ultimately prove that the adverse employment action taken was based on his or her age. Since direct evidence of such motivation is seldom available, the courts use a system of shifting burdens as an aid to the presentation and resolution of age discrimination cases. That system necessarily establishes the basic framework for reviewing motions for summary judgment in such cases. (*Hersant v. Department of Social Services* (1997) 57 Cal.App.4th 997, 1002 [67 Cal.Rptr.2d 483], internal citations omitted.)

- "While we agree that a plaintiff must demonstrate some basic level of competence at his or her job in order to meet the requirements of a prima facie showing, the burden-shifting framework established in *McDonnell Douglas* compels the conclusion that any measurement of such competency should, to the extent possible, be based on objective, rather than subjective, criteria. A plaintiff's burden in making a prima facie case of discrimination is not intended to be 'onerous.' Rather, the prima facie burden exists in order to weed out patently unmeritorious claims." (*Sandell, supra,* 188 Cal.App.4th at p. 322.)

- "A discharge is not 'on the ground of age' within the meaning of this prohibition unless age is a 'motivating factor' in the decision. Thus, ' "an employer would be entitled to judgment as a

matter of law if the record conclusively revealed some other, nondiscriminatory reason for the employer's decision." ' '[A]n employee claiming discrimination must offer substantial evidence that the employer's stated nondiscriminatory reason for the adverse action was untrue or pretextual, or evidence the employer acted with a discriminatory animus, or a combination of the two, such that a reasonable trier of fact could conclude the employer engaged in intentional discrimination.' " (*West v. Bechtel Corp.* (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 966, 978 [111 Cal.Rptr.2d 647].)

Secondary Sources

3 Wilcox, California Employment Law, Ch. 41, *Substantive Requirements Under Equal Employment Opportunity Laws,* § 43.31 (Matthew Bender)

2924. Status as Defendant's Employee—Subservant Company

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims [he/she/[***name of decedent***]] was [***name of defendant***]'s employee because [he/she] was employed by [***name of primary employer***], a company that was controlled by [***name of defendant***]. To succeed on this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. ~~that~~ That **[***name of defendant***] controlled or had the right to control the daily operations of [***name of primary employer***];**

2. **That [***name of defendant***] controlled or had the right to control the physical conduct of [***name of primary employer***]'s employees in the course of the work during which [***name of plaintiff***] was injured; and**

3. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was performing services for the benefit of [***name of defendant***] at the time of injury.**

~~**. Sharing information or coordinating efforts between two companies, by itself, is not enough to establish the right to control.**~~

~~**In deciding whether [***name of defendant***] controlled [***name of primary employer***], you should consider the following:**~~

~~**(a) Did the two companies share directors or management-level officers?**~~

~~**(b) Did the two companies share strategies, policies, sales, administrative, and operating staffs?**~~

~~**(c) Did the two companies share payroll and personnel records?**~~

~~**(d) Did [***name of defendant***] have a right to participate in [***name of primary employer***]'s day-to-day operations?**~~

~~**(e) Did [***name of defendant***] establish [***name of primary employer***]'s work procedures?**~~

~~**(f) [***Insert other applicable factor.***]**~~

~~**A "yes" answer to one or more of these questions suggests that the right to control exists. "No" answers suggest that the right to control does not exist. You should consider the relative importance of each factor and not simply count the number of "yes" and "no" answers. Remember that the ultimate test is the right to control.**~~

New September 2003; Revised June 2011

Sources and Authority

- "In the *Kelley* case, the Supreme Court recognized that if a second company could be shown to be a

conventional common-law servant, the 'control or right to control' test would be met." (*Bradsher v. Missouri Pacific Railroad* (8th Cir. 1982) 679 F.2d 1253, 1257-1258, internal citation omitted.)

- "To prove WFE was [defendant]'s servant, [plaintiff] must establish [defendant] controlled or had the right to control the physical conduct of WFE's employees in the course of the work during which the injury allegedly occurred. The subservant theory presupposes the existence of two separate entities in a master-servant relationship. A plaintiff can proceed under this theory by showing his employer was the common-law servant of the defendant railroad such that the railroad controlled or had the right to control the employer's daily operations. A plaintiff must also show he was 'employed to perform services in the affairs of [the defendant railroad] and . . . with respect to the physical conduct in the performance of the services [was] subject to [that railroad's] control or right to control.' For [plaintiff] to succeed under the subservant theory, he must show [defendant] controlled or had the right to control his physical conduct on the job. It is not enough for him to merely show WFE was the railroad's agent, or that he was acting to fulfill the railroad's obligations; [defendant]'s generalized oversight of [plaintiff], without physical control or the right to exercise physical control of his daily work is insufficient." (*Schmidt v. Burlington Northern & Santa Fe Ry.* (9th Cir. 2010) 605 F.3d 686, 689–690, internal citations omitted.)

- "Where the evidence of control is in dispute, the case should go to the jury." (*Vanskike v. ACF Industries, Inc.* (8th Cir. 1981) 665 F.2d 188, 198, internal citations omitted.)

- "In this case ... the evidence of contacts between Southern Pacific employees and PMT employees may indicate, not direction or control, but rather the passing of information and the accommodation that is obviously required in a large and necessarily coordinated operation. The informal contacts between the two groups must assume a supervisory character before the PMT employees can be deemed pro hac vice employees of the railroad." (*Kelley v. Southern Pacific Co.* (1974) 419 U.S. 318, 330 [95 S.Ct. 472, 42 L.Ed.2d 498].)

Secondary Sources

42 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 485, *Railroads*, § 485.33 (Matthew Bender)

3011. Violation of Prisoner's Federal Civil Rights—Eighth Amendment—General Conditions of Confinement Claim (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] subjected [him/her] to prison conditions that violated [his/her] constitutional rights. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was imprisoned under conditions that deprived [him/her] of [***describe deprivation, e.g., out-of-cell exercise***]~~exposed [him/her] to a substantial risk of serious harm~~;**

2. **That the deprivation created a substantial risk of serious harm to [***name of plaintiff***]'s health or safety;**

~~2~~3. **That [***name of defendant***] knew or it was obvious that the deprivation created a substantial risk of serious harm to [***name of plaintiff***]'s health or safety~~knew the conditions created a substantial risk of serious harm and disregarded that risk by failing to take reasonable measures to correct it~~;**

4. **That there was no reasonable justification for the deprivation;**

~~3~~5. **That [***name of defendant***] was acting or purporting to act in the performance of [his/her] official duties;**

~~4~~6. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

~~5~~7. **That [***name of defendant***]'s conduct was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

New September 2003; Revised December 2010, June 2011

Directions for Use

The "official duties" referred to in element ~~3~~ 5 must be duties created pursuant to any state, county, or municipal law, ordinance, or regulation. This aspect of color of law most likely will not be an issue for the jury, so it has been omitted to shorten the wording of element ~~3~~5.

Sources and Authority

- 42 U.S.C. section 1983 provides, in part: "Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State ... subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law ... ."

- "Section 1983 claims may be brought in either state or federal court." (*Pitts v. County of Kern* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 340, 348 [70 Cal.Rptr.2d 823, 949 P.2d 920].)

- "It is undisputed that the treatment a prisoner receives in prison and the conditions under which he is confined are subject to scrutiny under the Eighth Amendment." (*Helling v. McKinney* (1993) 509 U.S. 25, 31 [113 S.Ct. 2475, 125 L.Ed.2d 22].)

- "Our cases have held that a prison official violates the Eighth Amendment only when two requirements are met. First, the deprivation alleged must be, objectively, 'sufficiently serious.' For a claim ... based on a failure to prevent harm, the inmate must show that he is incarcerated under conditions posing a substantial risk of serious harm. The second requirement follows from the principle that 'only the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain implicates the Eighth Amendment.' To violate the Cruel and Unusual Punishments Clause, a prison official must have a 'sufficiently culpable state of mind.' In prison-conditions cases that state of mind is one of 'deliberate indifference' to inmate health or safety ... ." (*Farmer v. Brennan* (1994) 511 U.S. 825, 834 [114 S.Ct. 1970, 128 L.Ed.2d 811], internal citations omitted.)

- "The second step, showing 'deliberate indifference,' involves a two part inquiry. First, the inmate must show that the prison officials were aware of a 'substantial risk of serious harm' to an inmate's health or safety. This part of our inquiry may be satisfied if the inmate shows that the risk posed by the deprivation is obvious. Second, the inmate must show that the prison officials had no 'reasonable' justification for the deprivation, in spite of that risk. (*Thomas v. Ponder* (9th Cir. 2010) 611 F.3d 1144, 1150, footnotes and internal citations omitted.)

- "We hold ... that a prison official cannot be found liable under the Eighth Amendment for denying an inmate humane conditions of confinement unless the official knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health or safety; the official must both be aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists, and he must also draw the inference." (*Farmer, supra,* 511 U.S. at p. 837.)

- "[E]xtreme deprivations are required to make out a conditions-of-confinement claim. Because routine discomfort is 'part of the penalty that criminal offenders pay for their offenses against society,' 'only those deprivations denying "the minimal civilized measure of life's necessities" are sufficiently grave to form the basis of an Eighth Amendment violation.' " (*Hudson v. McMillian* (1992) 503 U.S. 1, 9 [112 S.Ct. 995, 117 L.Ed.2d 156], internal citations omitted.)

- "Prison officials have a duty to ensure that prisoners are provided adequate shelter, food, clothing, sanitation, medical care, and personal safety." (*Johnson v. Lewis* (9th Cir. 2000) 217 F.3d 726, 731, internal citations omitted.)

- "The Supreme Court has interpreted the phrase 'under "color" of law' to mean 'under "pretense" of law.' A police officer's actions are under pretense of law only if they are 'in some way "related to the performance of his official duties." ' By contrast, an officer who is ' "pursuing his own goals and is not in any way subject to control by [his public employer]," ' does not act under color of law, unless he 'purports or pretends' to do so. Officers who engage in confrontations for personal reasons unrelated to law enforcement, and do not 'purport[] or pretend[]' to be officers, do not act under color

of law." (*Huffman v. County of Los Angeles* (9th Cir. 1998) 147 F.3d 1054, 1058, internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

3 Civil Rights Actions, Ch. 11, *Deprivation of Rights Under Color of State Law—Prisons*, ¶¶ 11.02–11.03 (Matthew Bender)

11 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 114, *Civil Rights: Prisoners' Rights*, § 114.28 (Matthew Bender)

3301. Below Cost Sales—Essential Factual Elements

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] engaged in unlawful sales below cost. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **[That [***name of defendant***] [offered to sell/sold] [***product/service~~s~~***] at a price that ~~is~~ was below cost;]**

   [or]

   [That [*name of defendant***] gave away [***product/service~~s~~***];]**

2. **That [***name of defendant***]'s purpose was to injure competitors or destroy competition;**

3. **That [***name of plaintiff***] was harmed; and**

4. **That [***name of defendant***]'s conduct was a substantial factor in causing [***name of plaintiff***]'s harm.**

If [*Name of plaintiff***] proves that [***name of defendant***] [[offered to sell/sold] [***product/service***] at a price that was below cost/ [or] gave away [***product/services***]], you may assume that [***name of defendant***]'s purpose was to injure competitors or destroy competition. [***Name of defendant***] has presented evidence [of a different purpose/[***specify other purpose***]]. Considering all of the evidence presented, you must decide whether [***name of plaintiff***] proved that [***name of defendant***]'s purpose was to injure competitors or destroy competition.**

New September 2003; Revised June 2011

Directions for Use

The word "price" as used here should be read sufficiently broadly to include "special rebates, collateral contracts, or any device of any nature whereby such sale below cost is in substance or fact effected." (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17049.) To the extent the circumstances of the case warrant it, the word "price" in the instruction may be supplemented or supplanted by other such price-related terms.

For instructions on "cost," see CACI No. 3303, *Definition of "Cost"*; CACI No. 3304, *Presumptions Concerning Costs—Manufacturer*; CACI No. 3305, *Presumptions Concerning Costs—Distributor*; and CACI No. 3306, *Methods of Allocating Costs to an Individual Product.*

Business and Professions Code sections 17071 and 17071.5 create a rebuttable presumption~~s~~ of the purpose or intent to injure competitors or destroy competition. The presumption ~~The Supreme Court has observed "[t]he obvious and only effect of this provision is to~~ require~~s~~ the defendants to go forward with evidence that would establish an affirmative defense or otherwise rebut the presumption~~such proof as would bring them within one of the exceptions or which would negative the prima facie showing~~ of

wrongful intent." (See *People v. Pay Less Drug Store* (1944) 25 Cal.2d 108, 114 [153 P.2d 9].) The plaintiff is entitled to an instruction on the presumption. (See *Bay Guardian Co. v. New Times Media LLC* (2010) 187 Cal.App.4th 438, 465 [114 Cal.Rptr.3d 392.) For possible affirmative defenses, see CACI No. 3331, *Affirmative Defense to Locality Discrimination, Below Cost Sales, and Loss Leader Sales Claims—Closed-out, Discontinued, Damaged, or Perishable Items*, CACI No. 3332, *Affirmative Defense to Locality Discrimination, Below Cost Sales, Loss Leader Sales, and Secret Rebates—Functional Classifications*, and CACI No. 3333, *Affirmative Defense to Locality Discrimination, Below Cost Sales, and Loss Leader Sales Claims—Meeting Competition.*

Sources and Authority

- Business and Professions Code section 17043 provides: "It is unlawful for any person engaged in business within this State to sell any article or product at less than the cost thereof to such vendor, or to give away any article or product, for the purpose of injuring competitors or destroying competition."

- Business and Professions Code section 17024 provides, in part: " 'Article or product' includes any article, product, commodity, thing of value, service or output of a service trade."

- Business and Professions Code section 17071 provides: "In all actions brought under this chapter proof of one or more acts of selling or giving away any article or product below cost or at discriminatory prices, together with proof of the injurious effect of such acts, is presumptive evidence of the purpose or intent to injure competitors or destroy competition."

- Business and Professions Code section 17082 provides, in part: "In any action under this chapter, it is not necessary to allege or prove actual damages or the threat thereof, or actual injury or the threat thereof, to the plaintiff. But, in addition to injunctive relief, any plaintiff in any such action shall be entitled to recover three times the amount of the actual damages, if any, sustained by the plaintiff, as well as three times the actual damages, if any, sustained by any person who has assigned to the plaintiff his claim for damages resulting from a violation of this chapter."

- "The purpose of the Unfair Practices Act (UPA) is 'to safeguard the public against the creation or perpetuation of monopolies and to foster and encourage competition, by prohibiting unfair, dishonest, deceptive, destructive, fraudulent and discriminatory practices by which fair and honest competition is destroyed or prevented.' It forbids most locality discriminations, the use of loss leaders, gifts, secret rebates, boycotts, and 'deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising.' It also prohibits the sale of goods and services below cost." (*Pan Asia Venture Capital Corp. v. Hearst Corp.* (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 424, 431-432 [88 Cal.Rptr.2d 118], internal citations omitted.)

- "Section 17043 uses the word 'purpose,' not 'intent,' not 'knowledge.' We therefore conclude that to violate section 17043, a company must act with the purpose, i.e., the desire, of injuring competitors or destroying competition." (*Cel-Tech Communications, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Telephone Co.* (1999) 20 Cal.4th 163, 174-175 [83 Cal.Rptr.2d 548, 973 P.2d 527].)

- "Proof that a defendant sold or distributed articles or products below cost will be 'presumptive evidence of the purpose or intent to injure competitors or destroy competition.' " (*Pan Asia Venture*

Capital Corp., supra, 74 Cal.App.4th at p. 432, internal citation omitted.)

- "[W]e conclude that the section 17071 presumption is properly categorized as one that affects the burden of proof rather than merely the burden of persuasion. 'A presumption affecting the burden of proof shifts the burden of persuasion on an ultimate fact to the party against whom the presumption operates upon a finding of the predicate facts.' 'A presumption meant to establish or implement some public policy other than facilitation of the particular action in which it applies is a presumption affecting the burden of proof.' As we view section 17071, the presumption is indicative of an effort by the Legislature to implement the public policy of facilitating proof of unlawful purpose of below-cost sales which injure a competitor by shifting the burden of proof to the party more in possession of relevant evidence demonstrating the true intent associated with the pricing scheme." (*Bay Guardian Co., supra*, 187 Cal.App.4th at p. 464, internal citations omitted.)

- " '[T]he allocation of evidentiary burdens [under section 17071 is] as follows: "Assuming proof of injury to a competitor has been made, California law allows plaintiffs to establish a prima facie case with proof of prices below average total cost. The defendant then has the burden of negating the inference of illegal intent or establishing an affirmative defense." … [Citation.]' The presumption 'may be rebutted by establishing one of the statute's affirmative defenses, such as meeting competition, see Cal.Bus. & Prof.Code § 17050, or by showing that the sales "were made in good faith and not for the purpose of injuring competitors or destroying competition." [Citation.]' 'After proof of the sales below cost and injury resulting therefrom, there is no undue hardship cast upon the defendants to require them to come forward with evidence of their true intent as against the prima facie showing, or with evidence which will bring them within a specified exception in the act.' Once the presumption is rebutted, 'the burden shifts back to the moving party to offer actual proof of injurious intent.' " (*Bay Guardian Co., supra*, 187 Cal.App.4th at pp. 464–465, internal citations omitted.)

- "The section 17071 presumption, being one that in both nature and consequence alters the burden of proof, did ' "not disappear in the face of evidence as to the nonexistence of the presumed fact. …" [Citations.]' Therefore, the fact that defendants denied any purpose to harm competition, and produced some evidence of good faith efforts to compete in the marketplace, did not negate plaintiff's right to an instruction on a presumption affecting the burden of proof of unlawful purpose. Defendants may have offered rebuttal evidence, but they did not negate the presumption by conclusive proof that negated unlawful purpose as a matter of law or compelled a finding on the issue in their favor based on this record." (*Bay Guardian Co., supra*, 187 Cal.App.4th at p. 465.)

- "Determination of the defendant's cost has always been treated as an issue of fact." (*Pan Asia Venture Capital Corp., supra,* 74 Cal.App.4th at p. 432.)

- ~~Business and Professions Code section 17082 provides, in part: "In any action under this chapter, it is not necessary to allege or prove actual damages or the threat thereof, or actual injury or the threat thereof, to the plaintiff. But, in addition to injunctive relief, any plaintiff in any such action shall be entitled to recover three times the amount of the actual damages, if any, sustained by the plaintiff, as well as three times the actual damages, if any, sustained by any person who has assigned to the plaintiff his claim for damages resulting from a violation of this chapter."~~

- "While, similar to other cases, damages cannot be awarded in antitrust cases upon sheer guesswork or speculation, the plaintiff seeking damages for loss of profits is required to establish only with reasonable probability the existence of some causal connection between defendant's wrongful act and some loss of the anticipated revenue. Once that has been accomplished, the jury will be permitted to act upon probable and inferential proof and to 'make a just and reasonable estimate of the damage based on relevant data, and render its verdict accordingly.' " (*Suburban Mobile Homes, Inc. v. AMFAC Communities, Inc.* (1980) 101 Cal.App.3d 532, 545 [161 Cal.Rptr. 811], internal citations omitted.)

- "Even the objectives of the [federal and state] laws, though certainly similar, are not identical. The Sherman Act and Robinson-Patman Act (15 U.S.C. § 13(a)) seek to prevent anticompetitive acts that impair competition or harm competitors, whereas the UPA reflects a broader '[l]egislative concern not only with the maintenance of competition, but with the maintenance of "fair and honest competition." [Citations.]' We disagree with defendants' characterization of the UPA as legislation that was merely 'intended to protect the public, not individual competitors.' The UPA has been described by our high court 'as a legislative attempt 'to regulate business as a whole by prohibiting practices which the legislature has determined constitute unfair trade practices.' " (*Bay Guardian Co., supra*, 187 Cal.App.4th at p. 457, internal citations omitted.)~~The federal law most comparable to the Unfair Practices Act is the Robinson-Patman Act (15 U.S.C. § 13 et seq.); that act differs substantially from the Unfair Practices Act, however. For a discussion of this subject, see *Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transportation* (1990) 219 Cal.App.3d 811 [268 Cal.Rptr. 856]. One notable difference is that the Robinson-Patman Act requires at least two actual sales. Thus, mere offers to sell cannot violate that act.~~

- "In light of the distinctions we discern, some glaring, some subtle, between section 17043 and the federal or other state predatory pricing laws, and particularly in light of the conspicuous focus of section 17043 upon the mental state of defendants' purpose rather than ultimate impact of below-cost pricing, we decline to imply a recoupment element in the statute where none has been expressed." (*Bay Guardian Co., supra*, 187 Cal.App.4th at p. 459, internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

1 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Contracts, §§ 609–615

3 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 40, *Fraud and Deceit and Other Business Torts,* § 40.153 (Matthew Bender)

49 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition*, § 565.52 (Matthew Bender)

23 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 235, *Unfair Competition*, § 235.22 et seq. (Matthew Bender)

1 Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Unfair Competition and Business Torts, Ch. 5, *Antitrust,* 5.46[3], 5.47[2]

3712. Joint Ventures

~~A joint venture and e~~Each of ~~its~~ the members of a joint venture, and the joint venture itself, are responsible for the wrongful conduct of a member acting within the scope of his or her authority.

You must decide whether a joint venture ~~existed~~ was created in this case. A joint venture exists ~~when~~if all of the following have been proved;

1. **~~t~~Two or more persons or business entities combine their property, skill, or knowledge to carry out a single business undertaking;**
2. **Each has an ownership interest in the business;**
3. **They have joint control over the business, even if they agree to delegate control; and**
4. **They ~~and~~ agree to share the ~~control,~~ profits~~,~~ and losses of the business.**

A joint venture can be formed by a written or oral agreement or by an agreement implied by the parties' conduct.

New September 2003; Revised June 2011

Directions for Use

This instruction can be modified for cases involving unincorporated associations by substituting the term "unincorporated association" for "joint venture."

Sources and Authority

- "A joint venture is 'an undertaking by two or more persons jointly to carry out a single business enterprise for profit.' " (*Weiner v. Fleischman* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 476, 482 [286 Cal.Rptr. 40, 816 P.2d 892], internal citations omitted.)
- "A joint venture has been defined in various ways, but most frequently perhaps as an association of two or more persons who combine their property, skill or knowledge to carry out a single business enterprise for profit." (*Holtz v. United Plumbing and Heating Co.* (1957) 49 Cal.2d 501, 506 [319 P.2d 617].)
- " 'There are three basic elements of a joint venture: the members must have joint control over the venture (even though they may delegate it), they must share the profits of the undertaking, and the members must each have an ownership interest in the enterprise. ….' 'Whether a joint venture actually exists depends on the intention of the parties. … [¶] … [¶] [W]here evidence is in dispute the existence or nonexistence of a joint venture is a question of fact to be determined by the jury. [Citation.]' " (*Unruh-Haxton v. Regents of University of California* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 343, 370

[76 Cal.Rptr.3d 146], internal citations omitted.)

- Joint ventures are similar to partnerships, but the term "joint venture" commonly applies to temporary business arrangements involving a single transaction: "From a legal standpoint, both relationships are virtually the same. Accordingly, the courts freely apply partnership law to joint ventures when appropriate." (*Weiner, supra,* 54 Cal.3d at p. 482.)

- "The incidents of a joint venture are in all important respects the same as those of a partnership. One such incident of partnership is that all partners are jointly and severally liable for partnership obligations, irrespective of their individual partnership interests. Because joint and several liability arises from the partnership or joint venture, Civil Code section 1431.2 [Proposition 51] is not applicable." (*Myrick v. Mastagni* (2010) 185 Cal.App.4th 1082, 1091 [111 Cal.Rptr.3d 165], internal citations omitted.)

- "It has generally been recognized that in order to create a joint venture there must be an agreement between the parties under which they have a community of interest, that is, a joint interest, in a common business undertaking, an understanding as to the sharing of profits and losses, and a right of joint control." (*Holtz, supra,* 49 Cal.2d at pp. 506-507.)

- "The joint enterprise theory, while rarely invoked outside the automobile accident context, is well established and recognized in this state as an exception to the general rule that imputed liability for the negligence of another will not be recognized." (*Christensen v. Superior Court* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 868, 893 [2 Cal.Rptr.2d 79, 820 P.2d 181], internal citation omitted.)

- "The term 'joint enterprise' may cause some confusion because it is 'sometimes used to define a noncommercial undertaking entered into by associates with equal voice in directing the conduct of the enterprise … .' However, when it is 'used to describe a business or commercial undertaking[,] it has been used interchangeably with the term "joint venture" and courts have not drawn any significant legal distinction between the two." (*Jeld-Wen, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 853, 872 [32 Cal.Rptr.3d 351], internal citation omitted.)

- ~~" 'There are three basic elements of a joint venture: the members must have joint control over the venture (even though they may delegate it), they must share the profits of the undertaking, and the members must each have an ownership interest in the enterprise. [Citation].' 'Whether a joint venture actually exists depends on the intention of the parties. [Citations.] [¶] … [¶] [W]here evidence is in dispute the existence or nonexistence of a joint venture is a question of fact to be determined by the jury. [Citation.]' " (*Unruh-Haxton v. Regents of University of California* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 343, 370 [76 Cal.Rptr.3d 146], internal citations omitted.)~~

Secondary Sources

6 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, § 1235

1 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 8, *Vicarious Liability*, § 8.07 (Matthew Bender)

37 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* (Matthew Bender)

10 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 100A, *Employer and Employee: Respondeat Superior* (Matthew Bender)

1 California Civil Practice: Torts (Thomson West) §§ 3:38–3:39

3921. Wrongful Death (Death of an Adult)

If you decide that [*name of plaintiff***] has proved [his/her] claim against [***name of defendant***] for the death of [***name of decedent***], you also must decide how much money will reasonably compensate [***name of plaintiff***] for the death of [***name of decedent***]. This compensation is called "damages."**

[*Name of plaintiff***] does not have to prove the exact amount of these damages. However, you must not speculate or guess in awarding damages.**

The damages claimed by [*name of plaintiff***] fall into two categories called economic damages and noneconomic damages. You will be asked to state the two categories of damages separately on the verdict form.**

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims the following economic damages:**

1. **The financial support, if any, that [***name of decedent***] would have contributed to the family during either the life expectancy that [***name of decedent***] had before [his/her] death or the life expectancy of [***name of plaintiff***], whichever is shorter;**

2. **The loss of gifts or benefits that [***name of plaintiff***] would have expected to receive from [***name of decedent***];**

3. **Funeral and burial expenses; and**

4. **The reasonable value of household services that [***name of decedent***] would have provided.**

Your award of any future economic damages must be reduced to present cash value.

[*Name of plaintiff***] also claims the following noneconomic damages:**

1. **The loss of [***name of decedent***]'s love, companionship, comfort, care, assistance, protection, affection, society, moral support; [and]**

[2. The loss of the enjoyment of sexual relations.]

[2. The loss of [*name of decedent***]'s training and guidance.]**

No fixed standard exists for deciding the amount of noneconomic damages. You must use your judgment to decide a reasonable amount based on the evidence and your common sense.

[For future noneconomic damages, determine the amount in current dollars paid at the

time of judgment that will compensate [*name of plaintiff*] for those damages. [This amount of noneconomic damages should not be further reduced to present cash value because that reduction should only be performed with respect to economic damages.]]

In determining [*name of plaintiff*]'s loss, do not consider:

1. **[*Name of plaintiff*]'s grief, sorrow, or mental anguish;**

2. **[*Name of decedent*]'s pain and suffering; or**

3. **The poverty or wealth of [*name of plaintiff*].**

In deciding a person's life expectancy, you may consider, among other factors, the average life expectancy of a person of that age, as well as that person's health, habits, activities, lifestyle, and occupation. According to [*insert source of information*], the average life expectancy of a [*insert number*]-year-old [male/female] is [*insert number*] years, and the average life expectancy of a [*insert number*]-year-old [male/female] is [*insert number*] years. This published information is evidence of how long a person is likely to live but is not conclusive. Some people live longer and others die sooner.

[In computing these damages, consider the losses suffered by all plaintiffs and return a verdict of a single amount for all plaintiffs. I will divide the amount [among/between] the plaintiffs.]

New September 2003; Revised December 2005, February 2007, April 2008, December 2009, June 2011

Directions for Use

One of the life-expectancy subjects in the second sentence of the second-to-last paragraph should be the decedent, and the other should be the plaintiff. This definition is intended to apply to the element of damages pertaining to the financial support that the decedent would have provided to the plaintiff.

Use of the life tables in *Vital Statistics of the United States*, published by the National Center for Health Statistics, is recommended. (See Life Expectancy Table—Male and Life Expectancy Table—Female, following the Damages series.) The first column shows the age interval between the two exact ages indicated. For example, 50–51 means the one-year interval between the fiftieth and fifty-first birthdays.

For an instruction, worksheets, and tables for use in reducing future economic damages to present value, see CACI No. 3904B, *Use of Present-Value Tables*.

The paragraph concerning not reducing noneconomic damages to present cash value is bracketed because the law is not clear. It has been held that all damages, pecuniary and nonpecuniary,

must be reduced to present value. (See *Fox v. Pacific Southwest Airlines* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 565, 569 [184 Cal.Rptr. 87]; cf. Restat 2d of Torts, § 913A [future *pecuniary* losses must be reduced to present value].) The view of the court in *Fox* was that damages for lost value of society, comfort, care, protection and companionship must be monetarily quantified, and thus become pecuniary and subject to reduction to present value. However, the California Supreme Court subsequently held that with regard to future pain and suffering, the amount that the jury is to award should already encompass the idea of today's dollars for tomorrow's loss (See *Salgado v. County of L.A.* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 629, 646–647 [80 Cal.Rptr.2d 46, 967 P.2d 585]), so there is no further reduction to present value. (See CACI No. 3904A, *Present Cash Value,* and CACI No. 3904B, *Use of Present-Value Tables*.) While it seems reasonable that *Salgado* should apply to wrongful death actions, no court has expressly so held. Include the last sentence only if both future economic and noneconomic damages are sought. Note that if only economic damages are to be reduced to present value, the jury must find separate amounts for economic and noneconomic damages. (See CACI No. VF-3905, *Damages for Wrongful Death (Death of an Adult)*.)

Sources and Authority

- Code of Civil Procedure section 377.60 provides:
  A cause of action for the death of a person caused by the wrongful act or neglect of another may be asserted by any of the following persons or by the decedent's personal representative on their behalf:

  (a) The decedent's surviving spouse, domestic partner, children, and issue of deceased children, or, if there is no surviving issue of the decedent, the persons, including the surviving spouse or domestic partner, who would be entitled to the property of the decedent by intestate succession.

  (b) Whether or not qualified under subdivision (a), if they were dependent on the decedent, the putative spouse, children of the putative spouse, stepchildren, or parents. As used in this subdivision, "putative spouse" means the surviving spouse of a void or voidable marriage who is found by the court to have believed in good faith that the marriage to the decedent was valid.

  (c) A minor, whether or not qualified under subdivision (a) or (b), if, at the time of the decedent's death, the minor resided for the previous 180 days in the decedent's household and was dependent on the decedent for one-half or more of the minor's support.

  (d) This section applies to any cause of action arising on or after January 1, 1993.

  (e) The addition of this section by Chapter 178 of the Statutes of 1992 was not intended to adversely affect the standing of any party having standing under prior law, and the standing of parties governed by that version of this section as added by Chapter 178 of the Statutes of 1992 shall be the same as specified herein as amended by Chapter 563 of the Statutes of 1996.

(f) For the purpose of this section, "domestic partner" has the meaning provided in Section 297 of the Family Code.

- Code of Civil Procedure section 377.61 provides: "In an action under this article, damages may be awarded that, under all the circumstances of the case, may be just, but may not include damages recoverable under Section 377.34. The court shall determine the respective rights in an award of the persons entitled to assert the cause of action."

- "A cause of action for wrongful death is purely statutory in nature, and therefore 'exists only so far and in favor of such person as the legislative power may declare.' " (*Barrett v. Superior Court* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1176, 1184 [272 Cal.Rptr. 304], internal citations omitted.)

- "There are three distinct public policy considerations involved in the legislative creation of a cause of action for wrongful death: '(1) compensation for survivors, (2) deterrence of conduct and (3) limitation, or lack thereof, upon the damages recoverable.' " (*Barrett, supra,* 222 Cal.App.3d at p. 1185, internal citation omitted.)

- "We therefore conclude, on this basis as well, that 'wrongful act' as used in section 377 means any kind of tortious act, including the tortious act of placing defective products into the stream of commerce." (*Barrett, supra,* 222 Cal.App.3d at p. 1191.)

- "In any action for wrongful death resulting from negligence, the complaint must contain allegations as to all the elements of actionable negligence." (*Jacoves v. United Merchandising Corp.* (1992) 9 Cal.App.4th 88, 105 [11 Cal.Rptr.2d 468], internal citation omitted.)

- "Damages for wrongful death are not limited to compensation for losses with 'ascertainable economic value.' Rather, the measure of damages is the value of the benefits the heirs could reasonably expect to receive from the deceased if she had lived." (*Allen v. Toledo* (1980) 109 Cal.App.3d 415, 423 [167 Cal.Rptr. 270], internal citations omitted.)

- ~~"The death of a father may also cause a special loss to the children." (*Syah v. Johnson* (1966) 247 Cal.App.2d 534, 547 [55 Cal.Rptr. 741], internal citation omitted.)~~

- "These benefits include the personal services, advice, and training the heirs would have received from the deceased, and the value of her society and companionship. 'The services of children, elderly parents, or nonworking spouses often do not result in measurable net income to the family unit, yet unquestionably the death of such a person represents a substantial "injury" to the family for which just compensation should be paid.' " (*Allen, supra,* 109 Cal.App.3d at p. 423, internal citations omitted.)

- The wrongful death statute "has long allowed the recovery of funeral expenses in California wrongful death actions." (*Vander Lind v. Superior Court* (1983) 146 Cal.App.3d 358, 364 [194 Cal.Rptr. 209].)

- "Where, as here, decedent was a husband and father, a significant element of damages is the loss of financial benefits he was contributing to his family by way of support at the time of his death and that support reasonably expected in the future. The total future lost support must be reduced by appropriate formula to a present lump sum which, when invested to yield the highest rate of return consistent with reasonable security, will pay the equivalent of lost future benefits at the times, in the amounts and for the period such future benefits would have been received." (*Canavin v. Pacific Southwest Airlines* (1983) 148 Cal.App.3d 512, 52–521 [196 Cal.Rptr. 82], internal citations omitted.)

- "To avoid confusion regarding the jury's task in future cases, we conclude that when future noneconomic damages are sought, the jury should be instructed expressly that they are to assume that an award of future damages is a present value sum, i.e., they are to determine the amount *in current dollars paid at the time of judgment* that will compensate a plaintiff for future pain and suffering. In the absence of such instruction, unless the record clearly establishes otherwise, awards of future damages will be considered to be stated in terms of their present or current value." (*Salgado, supra,* 19 Cal.4th at pp. 646–647, original italics.)

- "The California statutes and decisions ... have been interpreted to bar the recovery of punitive damages in a wrongful death action." (*Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California* (1976) 17 Cal.3d 425, 450 [131 Cal.Rptr. 14, 551 P.2d 334], internal citation omitted.) There is an exception to this rule for death by felony homicide for which the defendant has been convicted. (Civ. Code, § 3294(d).)

- "Punitive damages are awardable to the decedent's estate in an action by the estate representative based on the cause of action the decedent would have had if he or she had survived." (*Rufo v. Simpson* (2001) 86 Cal.App.4th 573, 616 [103 Cal.Rptr.2d 492], internal citation omitted.)

- "California cases have uniformly held that damages for mental and emotional distress, including grief and sorrow, are not recoverable in a wrongful death action." (*Krouse v. Graham* (1977) 19 Cal.3d 59, 72 [137 Cal.Rptr. 863, 562 P.2d 1022], internal citations omitted.)

- "[A] simple instruction excluding considerations of grief and sorrow in wrongful death actions will normally suffice." (*Krouse, supra,* 19 Cal.3d at p. 69.)

- "[T]he competing and conflicting interests of the respective heirs, the difficulty in ascertaining individual shares of lost economic support when dealing with minors, the lack of any reason under most circumstances to apportion the lump-sum award attributable to loss of monetary support where minors are involved, the irrelevance of the heirs' respective interests in that portion of the award pertaining to lost economic support in determining the aggregate award, and the more efficient nature of court proceedings without a jury, cumulatively establish apportionment by the court, rather than the jury, is consistent with the efficient administration of justice." (*Canavin, supra,* 148 Cal.App.3d at pp. 535–536.)

- "[W]here all statutory plaintiffs properly represented by legal counsel waive judicial apportionment, the trial court should instruct the jury to return separate verdicts unless the remaining considerations enumerated above mandate refusal." (*Canavin, supra,* 148 Cal.App.3d at p. 536.)

- "We note that the court instructed the jury that in determining pecuniary loss they should consider inter alia the age, state of health and respective life expectancies of the deceased and each plaintiff but should be concerned only with 'the shorter of the life expectancies, that of one of the plaintiffs or that of the deceased. ...' This was a correct statement of the law." (*Francis v. Sauve* (1963) 222 Cal.App.2d 102, 120–121 [34 Cal.Rptr. 754], internal citation omitted.)

- "It is the shorter expectancy of life that is to be taken into consideration; for example, if, as in the case here, the expectancy of life of the parents is shorter than that of the son, the benefits to be considered are those only which might accrue during the life of the surviving parents." (*Parsons v. Easton* (1921) 184 Cal. 764, 770–771 [195 P. 419], internal citation omitted.)

- "The life expectancy of the deceased is a question of fact for the jury to decide, considering all relevant factors including the deceased's health, lifestyle and occupation. Life expectancy figures from mortality tables are admissible but are not conclusive." (*Allen, supra,* 109 Cal.App.3d at p. 424, internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

6 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, §§ 1690–1697

California Tort Damages (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) Wrongful Death, §§ 3.1–3.58

4 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 55, *Death and Survival Actions*, §§ 55.10–55.13 (Matthew Bender)

15 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 177, *Damages*, §§ 177.162–177.167 (Matthew Bender)

6 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 64, *Damages: Tort*, § 64.25 (Matthew Bender)

California Civil Practice (Thomson West) Torts, §§ 23:8–23:8.2

3922. Wrongful Death (Parents' Recovery for Death of a Minor Child)

If you decide that [*name of plaintiff*] has proved [his/her] claim against [*name of defendant*] for the death of [*name of minor*], you also must decide how much money will reasonably compensate [*name of plaintiff*] for the death of [*name of minor*]. This compensation is called "damages."

[*Name of plaintiff*] does not have to prove the exact amount of these damages. However, you must not speculate or guess in awarding damages.

The damages claimed by [*name of plaintiff*] fall into two categories called economic damages and noneconomic damages. You will be asked to state the two categories of damages separately on the verdict form.

[*Name of plaintiff*] claims the following economic damages:

1. **The value of the financial support, if any, that [*name of minor*] would have contributed to the family during either the life expectancy that [*name of minor*] had before [his/her] death or the life expectancy of [*name of plaintiff*], whichever is shorter;**

2. **The loss of gifts or benefits that [*name of plaintiff*] could have expected to receive from [*name of minor*];**

3. **Funeral and burial expenses; and**

4. **The reasonable value of household services that [*name of minor*] would have provided.**

Your award of any future economic damages must be reduced to present cash value.

[*Name of plaintiff*] also claims the following noneconomic damages: The loss of [*name of minor*]'s love, companionship, comfort, care, assistance, protection, affection, society, and moral support.

No fixed standard exists for deciding the amount of noneconomic damages. You must use your judgment to decide a reasonable amount based on the evidence and your common sense.

[For future noneconomic damages, determine the amount in current dollars paid at the time of judgment that will compensate [*name of plaintiff*] for those damages. [This amount of noneconomic damages should not be further reduced to present cash value because that reduction should only be performed with respect to economic damages.]]

Do not include in your award any compensation for the following:

1. **[*Name of plaintiff*]'s grief, sorrow, or mental anguish; or**

2. [*Name of minor*]'s pain and suffering.

In computing these damages, you should deduct the present cash value of the probable costs of [*name of minor*]'s support and education.

In deciding a person's life expectancy, consider, among other factors, that person's health, habits, activities, lifestyle, and occupation. Life expectancy tables are evidence of a person's life expectancy but are not conclusive.

[In computing these damages, consider the losses suffered by all plaintiffs and return a verdict of a single amount for all plaintiffs. I will divide the amount [among/between] the plaintiffs.]

New September 2003; Revised December 2005, April 2008, December 2009, June 2011

Directions for Use

Use of the life tables in *Vital Statistics of the United States*, published by the National Center for Health Statistics, is recommended. (See Life Expectancy Table—Male and Life Expectancy Table—Female, following the Damages series.) The first column shows the age interval between the two exact ages indicated. For example, 50–51 means the one-year interval between the fiftieth and fifty-first birthdays.

For an instruction, worksheets, and tables for use in reducing future economic damages to present value, see CACI No. 3904B, *Use of Present-Value Tables*.

The paragraph concerning not reducing noneconomic damages to present cash value is bracketed because the law is not clear. It has been held that all damages, pecuniary and nonpecuniary, must be reduced to present value. (See *Fox v. Pacific Southwest Airlines* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 565, 569 [184 Cal.Rptr. 87]; cf. Restat 2d of Torts, § 913A [future *pecuniary* losses must be reduced to present value].) The view of the court in *Fox* was that damages for lost value of society, comfort, care, protection and companionship must be monetarily quantified, and thus become pecuniary and subject to reduction to present value. However, the California Supreme Court subsequently held that with regard to future pain and suffering, the amount that the jury is to award should already encompass the idea of today's dollars for tomorrow's loss (See *Salgado v. County of L.A.* (1998) 19 Cal.4th 629, 646–647 [80 Cal.Rptr.2d 46, 967 P.2d 585]), so there is no further reduction to present value. (See CACI No. 3904A, *Present Cash Value* and CACI No. 3904B, *Use of Present-Value Tables*.) While it seems reasonable that *Salgado* should apply to wrongful death actions, no court has expressly so held. Include the last sentence only if both future economic and noneconomic damages are sought. Note that if only economic damages are to be reduced to present value, the jury must find separate amounts for economic and noneconomic damages. (See CACI No. VF-3906, *Damages for Wrongful Death (Parents' Recovery for Death of a Minor Child)*.)

Sources and Authority

- Code of Civil Procedure section 377.60 provides:

  A cause of action for the death of a person caused by the wrongful act or neglect of another may

be asserted by any of the following persons or by the decedent's personal representative on their behalf:

(a) The decedent's surviving spouse, domestic partner, children, and issue of deceased children, or, if there is no surviving issue of the decedent, the persons, including the surviving spouse or domestic partner, who would be entitled to the property of the decedent by intestate succession.

(b) Whether or not qualified under subdivision (a), if they were dependent on the decedent, the putative spouse, children of the putative spouse, stepchildren, or parents. As used in this subdivision, 'putative spouse' means the surviving spouse of a void or voidable marriage who is found by the court to have believed in good faith that the marriage to the decedent was valid.

(c) A minor, whether or not qualified under subdivision (a) or (b), if, at the time of the decedent's death, the minor resided for the previous 180 days in the decedent's household and was dependent on the decedent for one-half or more of the minor's support.

(d) This section applies to any cause of action arising on or after January 1, 1993.

(e) The addition of this section by Chapter 178 of the Statutes of 1992 was not intended to adversely affect the standing of any party having standing under prior law, and the standing of parties governed by that version of this section as added by Chapter 178 of the Statutes of 1992 shall be the same as specified herein as amended by Chapter 563 of the Statutes of 1996.

(f) For the purpose of this section, "domestic partner" has the meaning provided in Section 297 of the Family Code.

- Code of Civil Procedure section 377.61 provides: "In an action under this article, damages may be awarded that, under all the circumstances of the case, may be just, but may not include damages recoverable under Section 377.34. The court shall determine the respective rights in an award of the persons entitled to assert the cause of action."

- "A cause of action for wrongful death is purely statutory in nature, and therefore 'exists only so far and in favor of such person as the legislative power may declare.' " (*Barrett v. Superior Court* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1176, 1184 [272 Cal.Rptr. 304], internal citations omitted.)

- "Where the deceased was a minor child, recovery is based on the present value of reasonably probable future services and contributions, deducting the probable cost of rearing the child." (6 Witkin, Summary of Cal. Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, § 1695.)

- "There is authority in such cases for deducting from the loss factors-including the pecuniary loss a parent suffers by being deprived of the comfort, protection and society of a child-the prospective cost to the parent of the child's support and education. [¶] Although neither the loss factors nor such

offsets are readily measurable in a particular case—nor need they be measured in precise terms of dollars and cents—in the case at bench the jury had before it for consideration a court order subject to mathematical computation which required plaintiff to pay support for his child in the sum of $125 monthly. The jury was entitled and required to take into consideration the prospective cost to plaintiff of the boy's maintenance and rearing, and they may well have offset their reasonable appraisal of such costs, under the general verdict, against any pecuniary loss which they found that plaintiff suffered." (*Fields v. Riley* (1969) 1 Cal.App.3d 308, 315 [81 Cal.Rptr. 671], internal citations omitted.)

- "There are three distinct public policy considerations involved in the legislative creation of a cause of action for wrongful death: '(1) compensation for survivors, (2) deterrence of conduct and (3) limitation, or lack thereof, upon the damages recoverable.' " (*Barrett, supra,* 222 Cal.App.3d at p. 1185, internal citation omitted.)

- "We therefore conclude, on this basis as well, that 'wrongful act' as used in section 377 means any kind of tortious act, including the tortious act of placing defective products into the stream of commerce." (*Barrett, supra,* 222 Cal.App.3d at p. 1191.)

- "In any action for wrongful death resulting from negligence, the complaint must contain allegations as to all the elements of actionable negligence." (*Jacoves v. United Merchandising Corp.* (1992) 9 Cal.App.4th 88, 105 [11 Cal.Rptr.2d 468], internal citation omitted.)

- "Damages for wrongful death are not limited to compensation for losses with 'ascertainable economic value.' Rather, the measure of damages is the value of the benefits the heirs could reasonably expect to receive from the deceased if she had lived." (*Allen v. Toledo* (1980) 109 Cal.App.3d 415, 423 [167 Cal.Rptr. 270], internal citations omitted.)

- The wrongful death statute "has long allowed the recovery of funeral expenses in California wrongful death actions." (*Vander Lind v. Superior Court* (1983) 146 Cal.App.3d 358, 364 [194 Cal.Rptr. 209].)

- "The California statutes and decisions ... have been interpreted to bar the recovery of punitive damages in a wrongful death action." (*Tarasoff v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.* (1976) 17 Cal.3d 425, 450 [131 Cal.Rptr. 14, 551 P.2d 334], internal citation omitted.) There is an exception to this rule for death by felony homicide for which the defendant has been convicted. (Civ. Code, § 3294(d).)

- "Punitive damages are awardable to the decedent's estate in an action by the estate representative based on the cause of action the decedent would have had if he or she had survived." (*Rufo v. Simpson* (2001) 86 Cal.App.4th 573, 616 [103 Cal.Rptr.2d 492], internal citation omitted.)

- "California cases have uniformly held that damages for mental and emotional distress, including grief and sorrow, are not recoverable in a wrongful death action." (*Krouse v. Graham* (1977) 19 Cal.3d 59, 72 [137 Cal.Rptr. 863, 562 P.2d 1022], internal citations omitted.)

- "[A] simple instruction excluding considerations of grief and sorrow in wrongful death actions will normally suffice." (*Krouse, supra,* 19 Cal.3d at p. 69.)

- "To avoid confusion regarding the jury's task in future cases, we conclude that when future noneconomic damages are sought, the jury should be instructed expressly that they are to assume that an award of future damages is a present value sum, i.e., they are to determine the amount *in current dollars paid at the time of judgment* that will compensate a plaintiff for future pain and suffering. In the absence of such instruction, unless the record clearly establishes otherwise, awards of future damages will be considered to be stated in terms of their present or current value." (*Salgado, supra,* 19 Cal.4th at pp. 646–647, original italics.)

- "[T]he competing and conflicting interests of the respective heirs, the difficulty in ascertaining individual shares of lost economic support when dealing with minors, the lack of any reason under most circumstances to apportion the lump-sum award attributable to loss of monetary support where minors are involved, the irrelevance of the heirs' respective interests in that portion of the award pertaining to lost economic support in determining the aggregate award, and the more efficient nature of court proceedings without a jury, cumulatively establish [that] apportionment by the court, rather than the jury, is consistent with the efficient administration of justice." (*Canavin v. Pacific Southwest Airlines* (1983) 148 Cal.App.3d 512, 535–536 [196 Cal.Rptr. 82].)

- "[W]here all statutory plaintiffs properly represented by legal counsel waive judicial apportionment, the trial court should instruct the jury to return separate verdicts unless the remaining considerations enumerated above mandate refusal." (*Canavin, supra,* 148 Cal.App.3d at p. 536.)

- "We note that the court instructed the jury that in determining pecuniary loss they should consider inter alia the age, state of health and respective life expectancies of the deceased and each plaintiff but should be concerned only with 'the shorter of the life expectancies, that of one of the plaintiffs or that of the deceased. …' This was a correct statement of the law." (*Francis v. Sauve* (1963) 222 Cal.App.2d 102, 120–121 [34 Cal.Rptr. 754], internal citation omitted.)

- "It is the shorter expectancy of life that is to be taken into consideration; for example, if, as in the case here, the expectancy of life of the parents is shorter than that of the son, the benefits to be considered are those only which might accrue during the life of the surviving parents." (*Parsons v. Easton* (1921) 184 Cal. 764, 770–771 [195 P. 419], internal citation omitted.)

- "The life expectancy of the deceased is a question of fact for the jury to decide, considering all relevant factors including the deceased's health, lifestyle and occupation. Life expectancy figures from mortality tables are admissible but are not conclusive." (*Allen, supra,* 109 Cal.App.3d at p. 424, internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

6 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2005) Torts, § 1695

California Tort Damages (Cont.Ed.Bar) Wrongful Death, §§ 3.1–3.52

4 Levy et al., California Torts, Ch. 55, *Death and Survival Actions,* §§ 55.10–55.13 (Matthew Bender)

15 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 177, *Damages,* §§ 177.162–177.167 (Matthew Bender)

6 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 64, *Damages: Tort*, § 64.25 (Matthew Bender)

2 California Civil Practice: Torts (Thomson West) §§ 23:8–23:8.2

UNLAWFUL DETAINER

4302. Termination for Failure to Pay Rent—Essential Factual Elements

---

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] [and [***name of subtenant***], a subtenant of [***name of defendant***],] no longer [has/have] the right to occupy the property because [***name of defendant***] has failed to pay the rent. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***] [owns/leases] the property;**

2. **That [***name of plaintiff***] [rented/subleased] the property to [***name of defendant***];**

3. **That under the [lease/rental agreement/sublease], [***name of defendant***] was required to pay rent in the amount of $[***specify amount***] per [***specify period, e.g., month***];**

4. **That [***name of plaintiff***] properly gave [***name of defendant***] three days' written notice to pay the rent or vacate the property[, or that [***name of defendant***] actually received this notice at least three days before [***date on which action was filed***]];**

5. **That as of [***date of three-day notice***], at least the amount stated in the three-day notice was due;**

6. **That [***name of defendant***] did not pay [or attempt to pay] the amount stated in the notice within three days after [service/receipt] of the notice; and**

7. **That [***name of defendant***] [or subtenant [***name of subtenant***]] is still occupying the property.**

New August 2007; Revised June 2011

Directions for Use

Uncontested elements may be deleted from this instruction.

Include the bracketed references to a subtenancy in the opening paragraph and in element 7 if persons other than the tenant-defendant are occupying the premises.

If the plaintiff is the landlord or owner, select "owns" in element 1, "rented" in element 2, and either "lease" or "rental agreement" in element 3. Commercial documents are usually called "leases" while residential documents are often called "rental agreements." Select the term that is used on the written document. If the plaintiff is a tenant seeking to recover possession from a subtenant, select "leases" in element 1, "subleased" in element 2, and "sublease" in element 3. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1161(3).)

If service of notice may have been defective, but there is evidence that the defendant actually did receive it, include the bracketed language at the end of element 4. Defective service ~~is~~ may be waived if defendant admits receipt of notice. (See *Valov v. Tank* (1985) 168 Cal.App.3d 867, 876 [214 Cal.Rptr. 556].~~*Lehr v. Crosby* (1981) 123 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 6, fn. 3 [177 Cal.Rptr. 96]~~.) If a commercial lease requires service by a particular method, actual receipt by the tenant will not cure the landlord's failure to comply with the service requirements of the lease. (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P. v. Baja Fresh Westlake Village, Inc.* (2010) 185 Cal.App.4th 744, 752 [110 Cal.Rptr.3d 833].) Whether the same rule applies to a residential lease that specifies a method of service has not yet been decided.

If the lease specifies a time period for notice other than the three-day period, substitute that time period in elements 4, 5, and 6, provided that it is not less than three days.

There is a conflict in the case law with respect to when the three-day period begins if substituted service is used. Compare *Davidson v. Quinn* (1982) 138 Cal.App.3d Supp. 9, 14 [188 Cal.Rptr. 421] [tenant must be given three days to pay, so period does not begin until actual notice is received] with *Walters v. Meyers* (1990) 226 Cal.App.3d Supp. 15, 19–20 [277 Cal.Rptr. 316] [notice is effective when posted and mailed]. This conflict is accounted for in element 6.

See CACI No. 4303, *Sufficiency and Service of Notice of Termination for Failure to Pay Rent*, for an instruction regarding proper notice.

Sources and Authority

- Code of Civil Procedure section 1161 provides, in part:

  A tenant of real property … is guilty of unlawful detainer:

  2. When he or she continues in possession, in person or by subtenant, without the permission of his or her landlord … after default in the payment of rent, pursuant to the lease or agreement under which the property is held, and three days' notice, in writing, requiring its payment … shall have been served upon him or her and if there is a subtenant in actual occupation of the premises, also upon the subtenant."

- Civil Code section 1952.3(a) provides, in part: "[I]f the lessor brings an unlawful detainer proceeding and possession of the property is no longer in issue because possession of the property has been delivered to the lessor before trial or, if there is no trial, before judgment is entered, the case becomes an ordinary civil action … ."

- "[M]ere failure of a tenant to quit the premises during the three-day notice period does not necessarily justify an unlawful detainer action. If a tenant vacates the premises and surrenders possession to the landlord prior to the complaint being filed, then no action for unlawful detainer will lie even though the premises were not surrendered during the notice period. This is true because the purpose of an unlawful detainer action is to recover possession of the premises for the landlord. Since an action in unlawful detainer involves a

forfeiture of the tenant's right to possession, one of the matters that must be pleaded and proved for unlawful detainer is that the tenant remains in possession of the premises. Obviously this cannot be established where the tenant has surrendered the premises to landlord prior to the filing of the complaint. In such a situation the landlord's remedy is an action for damages and rent." (*Briggs v. Electronic Memories & Magnetics Corp.* (1975) 53 Cal.App.3d 900, 905–906 [126 Cal.Rptr. 34], footnote and internal citations omitted.)

- "Proper service on the lessee of a valid three-day notice to pay rent or quit is an essential prerequisite to a judgment declaring a lessor's right to possession under section 1161, subdivision 2. A lessor must allege and prove proper service of the requisite notice. Absent evidence the requisite notice was properly served pursuant to section 1162, no judgment for possession can be obtained." (*Liebovich v. Shahrokhkhany* (1997) 56 Cal.App.4th 511, 513 [65 Cal.Rptr.2d 457] internal citations omitted.)

- "Section 1162 does not authorize service of a three-day notice to pay rent or quit by mail delivery alone, certified or otherwise. It provides for service by: personal delivery; leaving a copy with a person of suitable age and discretion at the renter's residence or usual place of business *and* sending a copy through the mail to the tenant's *residence*; or posting *and* delivery of a copy to a person there residing, if one can be found, *and* sending a copy through the mail. Strict compliance with the statute is required." (*Liebovich, supra,* 56 Cal.App.4th at p. 516, original italics, internal citations omitted.)

- "If the tenant gives up possession of the property after the commencement of an unlawful detainer proceeding, the action becomes an ordinary one for damages." (*Fish Construction Co. v. Moselle Coach Works, Inc.* (1983) 148 Cal.App.3d 654, 658 [196 Cal.Rptr. 174].)

Secondary Sources

12 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2006) Real Property, §§ 720, 723

1 California Landlord-Tenant Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§ 8.35–8.45

1 California Eviction Defense Manual (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§ 5.2, 6.17–6.37

7 California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 210, *Unlawful Detainer*, §§ 210.21, 210.22 (Matthew Bender)

Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Landlord-Tenant Litigation, Ch. 5, *Unlawful Detainer*, 5.07

29 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*, § 333.10 (Matthew Bender)

Miller & Starr, California Real Estate (Thomson West) Ch. 19, *Landlord-Tenant*, § 19:200

4303. Sufficiency and Service of Notice of Termination for Failure to Pay Rent

[*Name of plaintiff***] contends that [he/she/it] properly gave [***name of defendant***] three days' notice to pay the rent or vacate the property. To prove that the notice contained the required information and was properly given, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That the notice informed [***name of defendant***] in writing that [he/she/it] must pay the amount due within three days or vacate the property;**

2. **That the notice stated [no more than/a reasonable estimate of] the amount due, and the name, telephone number, and address of the person to whom the amount should be paid, and**

   [*Use if payment was to be made personally.*

   the usual days and hours that the person would be available to receive the payment;]

   [*or: Use if payment was to be made into a bank account.*

   the number of an account in a bank located within five miles of the rental property into which the payment could be made, and the name and street address of the bank;]

   [*or: Use if an electronic funds transfer procedure had been previously established.*

   that payment could be made by electronic funds transfer;]

3. **That the notice was given to [***name of defendant***] at least three days before [***insert date on which action was filed***].**

Notice was properly given if [*select one or more of the following manners of service:***]**

[the notice was delivered to [*name of defendant***] personally[./; or]]**

~~[or:~~

[[*name of defendant***] was not at [home or work/the commercial rental property], and the notice was left with a responsible person at [[***name of defendant***]'s residence or place of work/the commercial property], and a copy was also mailed ~~to the address of the rented property~~ in an envelope addressed to [***name of defendant***] at [[his/her] residence/the commercial property]. In this case, notice is considered given on the date the second notice was [received by [***name of defendant***]/placed in the mail][./; or]]**

[~~or~~*for a residential tenancy*:

[*name of defendant***]'s place of residence and work could not be discovered, or a responsible person could not be found at either place, and (1) the notice was posted on the property in a place where it would easily be noticed, (2) a copy was given to a person living there if someone could be found, and (3) ~~a responsible person was not present at [***name of defendant***]'s residence or work, and the notice was posted on the property in a place where it would easily be noticed, and~~ a copy was also mailed to the address of the rented property in an envelope addressed to [***name of defendant***]. In this case, notice is considered given on the date the second notice was [received by [***name of defendant***]/placed in the mail].]**

[*or for a commercial tenancy:*

at the time of attempted service, a responsible person could not be found at the rental property through the exercise of reasonable diligence, and (1) the notice was posted on the property in a place where it would easily be noticed, and (2) a copy was also mailed to the address of the commercial property in an envelope addressed to [*name of defendant***]. In this case, notice is considered given on the date the second notice was [received by [***name of defendant***]/placed in the mail].]**

[The three-day notice period begins the day after the notice was given to [*name of defendant***]. If the last day of the notice period falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, [***name of defendant***]'s time to pay the rent or vacate the property is extended to include the first day after the Saturday, Sunday, or holiday that is not also a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday.]**

[If [*name of plaintiff***] did not properly give [***name of defendant***] the required written notice, the notice is still effective if [***name of defendant***] actually received it at least three days before [***insert date on which action was filed***].]**

[A notice stating a reasonable estimate of the amount of rent due that is within 20 percent of the amount actually due is reasonable unless [*name of defendant***] proves that it was not reasonable. In determining the reasonableness of the estimate, you may consider whether calculating the amount of rent required information primarily within the knowledge of [***name of defendant***] and whether [***name of defendant***] accurately furnished that information to [***name of plaintiff***].]**

New August 2007; Revised December 2010; June 2011

Directions for Use

Use the reasonable-estimate option in the first sentence of element 2 and include the final paragraph only in cases involving commercial leases. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1161.1(a); see also

Code Civ. Proc., § 1161.1(e) [presumption that if amount found to be due is within 20 percent of amount stated in notice, then estimate was reasonable].)

In element 2, select the applicable manner in which the notice specifies that payment is to be made; directly to the landlord, into a bank account, or by electronic funds transfer. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1161(2).)

Select the manner of service used; personal service, substituted service by leaving the notice at the defendant's home or place of work or at the commercial rental property, or substituted service by posting on the property. (See Code Civ. Proc., § 1162~~(a)~~.) ~~Adapt if needed for a commercial tenancy. (See Code Civ. Proc., § 1162(b).)~~

There is a conflict in the case law with respect to when the three-day period begins if substituted service is used. Compare *Davidson v. Quinn* (1982) 138 Cal.App.3d Supp. 9, 14 [188 Cal.Rptr. 421] [tenant must be given three days to pay, so period does not begin until actual notice is received] with *Walters v. Meyers* (1990) 226 Cal.App.3d Supp. 15, 19–20 [277 Cal.Rptr. 316] [notice is effective when posted and mailed]. This conflict is accounted for in the second, ~~and~~ third, and fourth bracketed options for the manner of service.

Read the third-to-last paragraph if the last day of the notice period fell on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday.

If a lease specifies a time period for giving notice other than the three-day period, substitute that time period for three days throughout, provided that it is not less than three days.

If service of notice may have been defective, but there is evidence that the defendant actually did receive it, include the next-to-last paragraph. Defective service ~~is~~ may be waived if defendant admits receipt of notice. (See *Valov v. Tank* (1985) 168 Cal.App.3d 867, 876 [214 Cal.Rptr. 556]~~*Lehr v. Crosby* (1981) 123 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 6, fn. 3 [177 Cal.Rptr. 96]~~.) If a commercial lease requires service by a particular method, actual receipt by the tenant will not cure the landlord's failure to comply with the service requirements of the lease. (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P. v. Baja Fresh Westlake Village, Inc.* (2010) 185 Cal.App.4th 744, 752 [110 Cal.Rptr.3d 833].) Whether the same rule applies to a residential lease that specifies a method of service has not yet been decided.

Local ordinances may impose additional notice requirements for the termination of a rental agreement. This instruction should be modified accordingly.

Sources and Authority

- Code Civil Procedure section 1161(2) provides, in part: "When he or she continues in possession … without the permission of his or her landlord … after default in the payment of rent … and three days' notice, in writing, requiring its payment, stating the amount which is due, the name, telephone number, and address of the person to whom the rent payment shall be made, and, if payment may be made personally, the usual days and hours that person will be available to receive the payment (provided that, if the address does not allow for personal

delivery, then it shall be conclusively presumed that upon the mailing of any rent or notice to the owner by the tenant to the name and address provided, the notice or rent is deemed received by the owner on the date posted, if the tenant can show proof of mailing to the name and address provided by the owner), or the number of an account in a financial institution into which the rental payment may be made, and the name and street address of the institution (provided that the institution is located within five miles of the rental property), or if an electronic funds transfer procedure has been previously established, that payment may be made pursuant to that procedure, or possession of the property, shall have been served upon him or her and if there is a subtenant in actual occupation of the premises, also upon the subtenant."

- Code of Civil Procedure 1161.1 provides, in part:

  With respect to application of Section 1161 in cases of possession of commercial real property after default in the payment of rent:

  (a) If the amount stated in the notice provided to the tenant pursuant to subdivision (2) of Section 1161 is clearly identified by the notice as an estimate and the amount claimed is not in fact correct, but it is determined upon the trial or other judicial determination that rent was owing, and the amount claimed in the notice was reasonably estimated, the tenant shall be subject to judgment for possession and the actual amount of rent and other sums found to be due. However, if (1) upon receipt of such a notice claiming an amount identified by the notice as an estimate, the tenant tenders to the landlord within the time for payment required by the notice, the amount which the tenant has reasonably estimated to be due and (2) if at trial it is determined that the amount of rent then due was the amount tendered by the tenant or a lesser amount, the tenant shall be deemed the prevailing party for all purposes. If the court determines that the amount so tendered by the tenant was less than the amount due, but was reasonably estimated, the tenant shall retain the right to possession if the tenant pays to the landlord within five days of the effective date of the judgment (1) the amount previously tendered if it had not been previously accepted, (2) the difference between the amount tendered and the amount determined by the court to be due, and (3) any other sums as ordered by the court.

  (e) For the purposes of this section, there is a presumption affecting the burden of proof that the amount of rent claimed or tendered is reasonably estimated if, in relation to the amount determined to be due upon the trial or other judicial determination of that issue, the amount claimed or tendered was no more than 20 percent more or less than the amount determined to be due. However, if the rent due is contingent upon information primarily within the knowledge of the one party to the lease and that information has not been furnished to, or has not accurately been furnished to, the other party, the court shall consider that fact in determining the reasonableness of the amount of rent claimed or tendered pursuant to subdivision (a).

- Code of Civil Procedure section 1162~~(a)~~ provides:

(a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), the notices required by Sections 1161 and 1161a may be served by any of the following methods:

(1) By delivering a copy to the tenant personally;

(2) If he or she is absent from his or her place of residence, and from his or her usual place of business, by leaving a copy with some person of suitable age and discretion at either place, and sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at his or her place of residence;

(3) If such place of residence and business can-not be ascertained, or a person of suitable age or discretion there can not be found, then by affixing a copy in a conspicuous place on the property, and also delivering a copy to a person there residing, if such person can be found; and also sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at the place where the property is situated. Service upon a subtenant may be made in the same manner.

(b) The notices required by Section 1161 may be served upon a commercial tenant by any of the following methods:

(1) By delivering a copy to the tenant personally.

(2) If he or she is absent from the commercial rental property, by leaving a copy with some person of suitable age and discretion at the property, and sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at the address where the property is situated.

(3) If, at the time of attempted service, a person of suitable age or discretion is not found at the rental property through the exercise of reasonable diligence, then by affixing a copy in a conspicuous place on the property, and also sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at the address where the property is situated. Service upon a subtenant may be made in the same manner.

(c) For purposes of subdivision (b), "commercial tenant" means a person or entity that hires any real property in this state that is not a dwelling unit, as defined in subdivision (c) of Section 1940 of the Civil Code, or a mobilehome, as defined in Section 798.3 of the Civil Code.

- "A valid three-day pay rent or quit notice is a prerequisite to an unlawful detainer action. Because of the summary nature of an unlawful detainer action, a notice is valid only if the lessor strictly complies with the statutorily mandated notice requirements. [¶] A three-day notice must contain 'the amount which is due.' A notice which demands rent in excess of the amount due does not satisfy this requirement. This rule ensures that a landlord will not be entitled to regain possession in an unlawful detainer action unless the tenant has had the opportunity to pay the delinquent rent." (*Bevill v. Zoura* (1994) 27 Cal.App.4th 694, 697 [32 Cal.Rptr.2d 635], internal citations and footnote omitted.)

- "[W]e do not agree that a proper notice may not include anything other than technical rent. It is true that subdivision 2 of Code of Civil Procedure section 1161 relates to a default in the payment of rent. However, the subdivision refers to the 'lease or agreement under which the property is held' and requires the notice state 'the amount which is due.' The language is not 'the amount of rent which is due' or 'the rent which is due.' We think the statutory language is sufficiently broad to encompass any sums due under the lease or agreement under which the property is held." (*Canal-Randolph Anaheim, Inc. v. Wilkoski* (1978) 78 Cal.App.3d 477, 492 [144 Cal.Rptr. 474].)

- "[T]he service and notice provisions in the unlawful detainer statutes and [Code of Civil Procedure] section 1013 are mutually exclusive, and thus, section 1013 does not extend the notice periods that are a prerequisite to filing an unlawful detainer action." (*Losornio v. Motta* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 110, 112 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 799].)

- "Section 1162 does not authorize service of a three-day notice to pay rent or quit by mail delivery alone, certified or otherwise. It provides for service by: personal delivery; leaving a copy with a person of suitable age and discretion at the renter's residence or usual place of business and sending a copy through the mail to the tenant's *residence*; or posting *and* delivery of a copy to a person there residing, if one can be found, *and* sending a copy through the mail. Strict compliance with the statute is required." (*Liebovich v. Shahrokhkhany* (1997) 56 Cal.App.4th 511, 516 [65 Cal.Rptr.2d 457], original italics, internal citation omitted.)

- "We … hold that service made in accordance with section 1162, subdivision 3, as applied to section 1161, subdivision 2, must be effected in such a manner as will give a tenant the three days of written notice required by the Legislature in which he may cure his default in the payment of rent." (*Davidson, supra,* 138 Cal.App.3d Supp. at p. 14.)

- "We … hold that service of the three-day notice by posting and mailing is effective on the date the notice is posted and mailed." (*Walters, supra,* 226 Cal.App.3d Supp. at p. 20.)

- "An unlawful detainer action based on failure to pay rent must be preceded by a three-day notice to the tenant to pay rent or quit the premises. Failure to state the exact amount of rent due in the notice is fatal to the subsequent unlawful detainer action." (*Lynch & Freytag v. Cooper* (1990) 218 Cal.App.3d 603, 606, fn. 2 [267 Cal.Rptr. 189], internal citations omitted.)

- "[D]efendant admitted in his answer that he 'ultimately received [the relevant] notice' but 'affirmatively allege[d] that he was not properly and legally served' with a valid notice. We find that, under the circumstances of this case, the defendant waived any defect in the challenged service of the notice under section 1162, subdivision 1." (*Valov, supra,* 168 Cal.App.3d at p. 876.)

- "In commercial leases the landlord and commercial tenant may lawfully agree to notice procedures that differ from those provided in the statutory provisions governing unlawful detainer." (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P., supra,* 185 Cal.App.4th at p.750.)

- "[E]ven if some policy rationale might support such a waiver/forfeiture [by actual receipt] rule in the residential lease context, there is no basis to apply it in the commercial context where matters of service and waiver are prescribed in the lease itself. Nothing in the parties' lease suggests actual receipt of a notice to quit results in the waiver or forfeiture of [tenant]'s right to service accomplished in the manner prescribed. To the contrary, the lease specifically provides, 'No covenant, term or condition, or breach' of the lease 'shall be deemed waived except if expressly waived in a written instrument executed by the waiving party.' Although [tenant's agent] acted on the notice to quit by attempting to deliver the rent check, neither her fortuitous receipt of the notice nor her actions in response to it constitutes an express waiver of the notice provisions in the lease." (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P., supra*, 185 Cal.App.4th at p. 752, internal citation omitted.)

Secondary Sources

12 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2006) Real Property, §§ 720, 722–725, 727

1 California Landlord-Tenant Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§ 8.26–8.68

1 California Eviction Defense Manual (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§ 5.2, 6.10–6.30, Ch. 8

7 California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 210, *Unlawful Detainer*, §§ 210.21, 210.22 (Matthew Bender)

Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Landlord-Tenant Litigation, Ch. 5, *Unlawful Detainer*, 5.11, 5.12

29 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*, § 333.11 (Matthew Bender)

23 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 236, *Unlawful Detainer*, §§ 236.13, 236.13A (Matthew Bender)

Miller & Starr, California Real Estate (Thomson West) Ch. 19, *Landlord-Tenant*, §§ 19:202–19:204

UNLAWFUL DETAINER

4304. Termination for Violation of Terms of Lease/Agreement—Essential Factual Elements

---

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] [and [***name of subtenant***], a subtenant of [***name of defendant***],] no longer [has/have] the right to occupy the property because [***name of defendant***] has failed to perform [a] requirement(s) under [his/her/its] [lease/rental agreement/sublease]. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***] [owns/leases] the property;**

2. **That [***name of plaintiff***] [rented/subleased] the property to [***name of defendant***];**

3. **That under the [lease/rental agreement/sublease], [***name of defendant***] agreed [***insert required condition(s) that were not performed***];**

4. **That [***name of defendant***] failed to perform [that/those] requirement(s) by [***insert description of alleged failure to perform***];**

5. **That [***name of plaintiff***] properly gave [***name of defendant***] [and [***name of subtenant***]] three days' written notice to [either [***describe action to correct failure to perform***] or] vacate the property[, or that [***name of defendant***] actually received this notice at least three days before [***date on which action was filed***]]; [and]**

[6. That [*name of defendant***] did not [***describe action to correct failure to perform***]; and]**

7. **That [***name of defendant***] [or subtenant [***name of subtenant***]] is still occupying the property.**

[[*Name of defendant***]'s failure to perform the requirement(s) of the [lease/rental agreement/sublease] must not be trivial, but must be a substantial violation of [an] important obligation(s).]**

New August 2007; Revised June 2010, December 2010; June 2011

Directions for Use

Uncontested elements may be deleted from this instruction.

Include the bracketed references to a subtenancy in the opening paragraph, in element 5, and in the last element if persons other than the tenant-defendant are in occupancy of the premises.

If the plaintiff is the landlord or owner, select either "lease" or "rental agreement" in the opening paragraph and in element 3, "owns" in element 1, and "rented" in element 2. Commercial documents are usually called "leases" while residential documents are often called "rental agreements." Select the term that is used on the written document.

If the plaintiff is a tenant seeking to recover possession from a subtenant, select "sublease" in the opening paragraph and in element 3, "leases" in element 1, and "subleased" in element 2. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1161(3).)

If service of notice may have been defective, but there is evidence that the defendant actually did receive it, include the bracketed language at the end of element 5. Defective service ~~is~~ may be waived if defendant admits timely receipt of notice. (See *Valov v. Tank* (1985) 168 Cal.App.3d 867, 876 [214 Cal.Rptr. 556]~~*Lehr v. Crosby* (1981) 123 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 6, fn. 3 [177 Cal.Rptr. 96]~~.) .. If a commercial lease requires service by a particular method, actual receipt by the tenant will not cure the landlord's failure to comply with the service requirements of the lease. (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P. v. Baja Fresh Westlake Village, Inc.* (2010) 185 Cal.App.4th 744, 752 [110 Cal.Rptr.3d 833].) Whether the same rule applies to a residential lease that specifies a method of service has not yet been decided.

If the lease specifies a time period for notice other than the three-day period, substitute that time period in element 5.

If the violation of the condition or covenant involves assignment, sublet, or waste, or if the breach cannot be cured, the landlord is entitled to possession on service of a three-day notice to quit; no opportunity to cure by performance is required. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1161(4) ; *Salton Community Services Dist. v. Southard* (1967) 256 Cal.App.2d 526, 529 [64 Cal.Rptr. 246].) In such a case, omit the bracketed language in element 5 and also omit element 6. If the violation involves nuisance or illegal activity, give CACI No. 4308, *Termination for Nuisance or Illegal Activity—Essential Factual Elements*.

Include the last paragraph if the tenant alleges that the violation was trivial. It is not settled whether the landlord must prove the violation was substantial or the tenant must prove triviality as an affirmative defense. (See *Superior Motels, Inc. v. Rinn Motor Hotels, Inc.* (1987) 195 Cal.App.3d 1032, 1051 [241 Cal.Rptr. 487]; *Keating v. Preston* (1940) 42 Cal.App.2d 110, 118 [108 P.2d 479].)

Local or federal law may impose additional requirements for the termination of a rental agreement based on breach of a condition. This instruction should be modified accordingly.

See CACI No. 4305, *Sufficiency and Service of Notice of Termination for Violation of Terms of Agreement*, for an instruction on proper written notice.

See also CACI No. 312, *Substantial Performance*.

Sources and Authority

- Code of Civil Procedure section 1161, repealed and replaced with a new version January 1, 2012, provides, in part:

  A tenant of real property … is guilty of unlawful detainer:

  > 3. When he or she continues in possession, in person or by subtenant, after a neglect or failure to perform other conditions or covenants of the lease or agreement under which the property is held, including any covenant not to assign or sublet, than the one for the payment of rent, and three days' notice, in writing, requiring the performance of such conditions or covenants, or the possession of the property, shall have been served upon him or her, and if there is a subtenant in actual occupation of the premises, also, upon the subtenant. Within three days after the service of the notice, the tenant, or any subtenant in actual occupation of the premises, or any mortgagee of the term, or other person interested in its continuance, may perform the conditions or covenants of the lease or pay the stipulated rent, as the case may be, and thereby save the lease from forfeiture; provided, if the conditions and covenants of the lease, violated by the lessee, cannot afterward be performed, then no notice, as last prescribed herein, need be given to the lessee or his or her subtenant, demanding the performance of the violated conditions or covenants of the lease.
  >
  > 4. Any tenant, subtenant, or executor or administrator of his or her estate heretofore qualified and now acting, or hereafter to be qualified and act, assigning or subletting or committing waste upon the demised premises, contrary to the conditions or covenants of his or her lease, or maintaining, committing, or permitting the maintenance or commission of a nuisance upon the demised premises or using the premises for an unlawful purpose, thereby terminates the lease, and the landlord, or his or her successor in estate, shall upon service of three days' notice to quit upon the person or persons in possession, be entitled to restitution of possession of the demised premises under this chapter. For purposes of this subdivision, a person who commits an offense described in subdivision (c) of Section 3485 of the Civil Code, or subdivision (c) of Section 3486 of the Civil Code, or uses the premises to further the purpose of that offense shall be deemed to have committed a nuisance upon the premises. For purposes of this subdivision, if a person commits an act of domestic violence as defined in Section 6211 of the Family Code, sexual assault as defined in Section 261, 261.5, 262, 286, 288a, or 289 of the Penal Code, or stalking as defined in Section 1708.7 of the Civil Code, against another tenant or subtenant on the premises there is a rebuttable presumption affecting the burden of proof that the person has committed a nuisance upon the premises, provided, however, that this shall not apply if the victim of the act of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking, or a household member of the victim, other than the perpetrator, has not vacated the premises. This subdivision shall not be construed to supersede the provisions of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-162) that permit the removal from a lease of a tenant who engages in criminal acts of physical violence against cotenants.

- Civil Code section 1952.3(a) provides, in part: "[I]f the lessor brings an unlawful detainer proceeding and possession of the property is no longer in issue because possession of the property has been delivered to the lessor before trial or, if there is no trial, before judgment is entered, the case becomes an ordinary civil action … ."

- "[Code of Civil Procedure section 1161(3)] provides, that where the conditions or covenants of a lease can be performed, a lessee may within three days after the service of the notice perform them, and so save a forfeiture of his lease. By performing, the tenant may defeat the landlord's claim for possession. Where, however, the covenants cannot be performed, the law recognizes that it would be an idle and useless ceremony to demand their performance, and so dispenses with the demand to do so. And this is all that it does dispense with. It does not dispense with the demand for the possession of the premises. It requires that in any event. If the covenants can be performed, the notice is in the alternative, either to perform them or deliver possession. When the covenants are beyond performance an alternative notice would be useless, and demand for possession alone is necessary. Bearing in mind that the object of this statute is to speedily permit a landlord to obtain possession of his premises where the tenant has violated the covenants of the lease, the only reasonable interpretation of the statute is, that before bringing suit he shall take that means which should be most effectual for the purpose of obtaining possession, which is to demand it. If upon demand the tenant surrenders possession, the necessity for any summary proceeding is at an end, and by the demand is accomplished what the law otherwise would accord him under the proceeding." (*Schnittger v. Rose* (1903) 139 Cal. 656, 662 [73 P. 449].)

- "It is well settled that the notice required under [Code Civ. Proc., § 1161] subdivisions 2 and 3 (where the condition or covenant assertedly violated is capable of being performed) must be framed in the alternative, viz., pay the rent *or* quit, perform the covenant *or* quit, and a notice which merely directs the tenant to quit is insufficient to render such tenant guilty of unlawful detainer upon his continued possession." (*Hinman v. Wagnon* (1959) 172 Cal.App.2d 24, 27 [341 P.2d 749], original italics.

- "Plaintiff argues, however, that he should be allowed to amend his complaint so as to bring his action under section 1161, subdivision 4. The notice thereunder required need not be framed in the alternative. However, plaintiff has at no time, either by his three days' notice or in any of his pleadings, suggested that defendant had assigned the lease or sublet the property, or had committed waste contrary to the conditions or covenants of the lease, or maintained a nuisance on the premises, or had used the property for an unlawful purpose. Plaintiff had three opportunities to state a cause of action; if he was of the belief that facts existed which brought his case under 1161, subdivision 4, it would have been a simple matter to allege such facts, but this he did not do." (*Hinman, supra*, 172 Cal.App.2d at p. 29.)

- "The law sensibly recognizes that although every instance of noncompliance with a contract's terms constitutes a breach, not every breach justifies treating the contract as terminated. Following the lead of the Restatements of Contracts, California courts allow termination only if the breach can be classified as 'material,' 'substantial,' or 'total.' " (*Superior Motels, Inc., supra,* 195 Cal.App.3d at p. 1051, internal citations omitted.)

- "California too accepts that '[whether] a breach is so material as to constitute cause for the injured party to terminate a contract is ordinarily a question for the trier of fact.' " (*Superior Motels, Inc., supra,* 195 Cal.App.3d at pp. 1051-1052, internal citations omitted.)

- "As to the substantiality of the violation, the evidence shows that the violation was wilful. Therefore, the court will not measure the extent of the violation." (*Hignell v. Gebala* (1949) 90 Cal.App.2d 61, 66 [202 P.2d 378].)

- "Where a covenant in a lease has been breached and the breach cannot be cured, a demand for performance is not a condition precedent to an unlawful detainer action." (*Salton Community Services Dist., supra,* 256 Cal.App.2d at p. 529.)

- "If the tenant gives up possession of the property after the commencement of an unlawful detainer proceeding, the action becomes an ordinary one for damages." (*Fish Construction Co. v. Moselle Coach Works, Inc.* (1983) 148 Cal.App.3d 654, 658 [196 Cal.Rptr. 174].)

Secondary Sources

12 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2006) Real Property, §§ 720, 723

1 California Landlord-Tenant Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§ 8.50–8.54

1 California Eviction Defense Manual (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§ 5.2, 6.38–6.49

7 California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 210, *Unlawful Detainer*, §§ 210.21, 210.23, 210.24 (Matthew Bender)

Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Landlord-Tenant Litigation, Ch. 5, *Unlawful Detainer*, 5.07

29 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*, § 333.10 (Matthew Bender)

23 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 236, *Unlawful Detainer*, §§ 236.11, 236.20 (Matthew Bender)

Miller & Starr, California Real Estate (Thomson Reuters West) Ch. 19, *Landlord-Tenant*, § 19:201

UNLAWFUL DETAINER

4305. Sufficiency and Service of Notice of Termination for Violation of Terms of Agreement

---

[*Name of plaintiff***] contends that [he/she/it] properly gave [***name of defendant***] three days' notice to [either comply with the requirements of the [lease/rental agreement/sublease] or] vacate the property. To prove that the notice contained the required information and was properly given, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That the notice informed [***name of defendant***] in writing that [he/she/it] must, within three days, [either comply with the requirements of the [lease/rental agreement/sublease] or] vacate the property;**

2. **That the notice described how [***name of defendant***] failed to comply with the requirements of the [lease/rental agreement/sublease] [and how to correct the failure];**

3. **That the notice was given to [***name of defendant***] at least three days before [***insert date on which action was filed***].**

Notice was properly given if [*select one or more of the following manners of service:***]**

[the notice was delivered to [*name of defendant***] personally[./; or]]**

~~[or:~~

[[*name of defendant***] was not at [home or work/the commercial rental property], and the notice was left with a responsible person at [[***name of defendant***]'s ~~residence~~ home or place of work/the commercial property], and a copy was also mailed ~~to the address of the rented property~~ in an envelope addressed to [***name of defendant***] at [[his/her] residence/the commercial property]. In this case, notice is considered given on the date the second notice was [received by [***name of defendant***]/placed in the mail][./; or]]**

[~~or~~*for a residential tenancy:*

[*name of defendant***]'s place of residence and work could not be discovered, or a responsible person could not be found at either place, and (1) the notice was posted on the property in a place where it would easily be noticed, (2) a copy was given to a person living there if someone could be found, and (3)~~a responsible person was not present at [*name of defendant*]'s residence or work, and the notice was posted on the property in a place where it would easily be noticed, and~~ a copy was also mailed to the address of the rented property in an envelope addressed to [***name of defendant***]. In this case, notice is considered given on the date the second notice was [received by [***name of defendant***]/placed in the mail].]**

[*or for a commercial tenancy:*

at the time of attempted service, a responsible person could not be found at the rental property through the exercise of reasonable diligence, and (1) the notice was posted on the property in a place where it would easily be noticed, and (2) a copy was also mailed to the address of the commercial property in an envelope addressed to [*name of defendant***]. In this case, notice is considered given on the date the second notice was [received by [***name of defendant***]/placed in the mail].]**

[The three-day notice period begins on the day after the notice was given to [*name of defendant***]. If the last day of the notice period falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, [***name of defendant***]'s time to correct the failure or to vacate the property is extended to include the first day after the Saturday, Sunday, or holiday that is not also a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday.]**

[If [*name of plaintiff***] did not properly give [***name of defendant***] the required written notice, the notice is still effective if [***name of defendant***] actually received it at least three days before [***insert date on which action was filed***].]**

New August 2007; Revised December 2010, June 2011

Directions for Use

If the violation of the condition or covenant involves assignment, subletting, or waste, or if the breach cannot be cured, the landlord is entitled to possession on service of a three-day notice to quit; no opportunity to cure by performance is required. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1161(4); *Salton Community Services Dist. v. Southard* (1967) 256 Cal.App.2d 526, 529 64 Cal.Rptr. 246].) In such a case, omit the bracketed language in the first paragraph and in elements 1 and 2. If the violation involves nuisance or illegal activity, give CACI No. 4309, *Sufficiency and Service of Notice of Termination for Nuisance or Illegal Activity*.

If the plaintiff is the landlord or owner, select either "lease" or "rental agreement" in the optional language in the opening paragraph and in elements 1 and 2. Commercial documents are usually called "leases" while residential documents are often called "rental agreements." Select the term that is used on the written document. If the plaintiff is a tenant seeking to recover possession from a subtenant, select "sublease." (Code Civ. Proc., § 1161(3).)

Select the manner of service used; personal service, substituted service by leaving the notice at the defendant's home or place of work or at the commercial rental property, or substituted service by posting on the property. (See Code Civ. Proc., § 1162~~(a)~~.) ~~Adapt if needed for a commercial tenancy. (See Code Civ. Proc., § 1162(b).)~~

There is a conflict in the case law with respect to when the three-day period begins if substituted service is used. Compare *Davidson v. Quinn* (1982) 138 Cal.App.3d Supp. 9, 14 [188 Cal.Rptr.

421] [tenant must be given three days to pay, so period does not begin until actual notice is received] with *Walters v. Meyers* (1990) 226 Cal.App.3d Supp. 15, 19–20 [277 Cal.Rptr. 316] [notice is effective when posted and mailed]. This conflict is accounted for in the second, ~~and~~ third, and fourth bracketed options for the manner of service.

Read the next-to-last paragraph if the last day of the notice period fell on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday.

If a lease specifies a time period for giving notice other than the three-day period, substitute that time period for three days throughout the instruction, provided that it is not less than three days.

If service of notice may have been defective, but there is evidence that the defendant actually did receive it, include the last paragraph. Defective service ~~is~~ may be waived if defendant admits timely receipt of notice. (See *Valov v. Tank* (1985) 168 Cal.App.3d 867, 876 [214 Cal.Rptr. 556]~~*Lehr v. Crosby* (1981) 123 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 6, fn. 3 [177 Cal.Rptr. 96]~~.) If a commercial lease requires service by a particular method, actual receipt by the tenant will not cure the landlord's failure to comply with the service requirements of the lease. (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P. v. Baja Fresh Westlake Village, Inc.* (2010) 185 Cal.App.4th 744, 752 [110 Cal.Rptr.3d 833].) Whether the same rule applies to a residential lease that specifies a method of service has not yet been decided.

Local ordinances may impose additional notice requirements for the termination of a rental agreement. This instruction should be modified accordingly.

Sources and Authority

- Code of Civil Procedure section 1161, repealed and replaced with a new version January 1, 2012, provides, in part:

  A tenant of real property … is guilty of unlawful detainer:

  > 3. When he or she continues in possession, in person or by subtenant, after a neglect or failure to perform other conditions or covenants of the lease or agreement under which the property is held, including any covenant not to assign or sublet, than the one for the payment of rent, and three days' notice, in writing, requiring the performance of such conditions or covenants, or the possession of the property, shall have been served upon him or her, and if there is a subtenant in actual occupation of the premises, also, upon the subtenant. Within three days after the service of the notice, the tenant, or any subtenant in actual occupation of the premises, or any mortgagee of the term, or other person interested in its continuance, may perform the conditions or covenants of the lease or pay the stipulated rent, as the case may be, and thereby save the lease from forfeiture; provided, if the conditions and covenants of the lease, violated by the lessee, cannot afterward be performed, then no notice, as last prescribed herein, need be given to the lessee or his or her subtenant, demanding the performance of the violated conditions or covenants of the lease.

4. Any tenant, subtenant, or executor or administrator of his or her estate heretofore qualified and now acting, or hereafter to be qualified and act, assigning or subletting or committing waste upon the demised premises, contrary to the conditions or covenants of his or her lease, or maintaining, committing, or permitting the maintenance or commission of a nuisance upon the demised premises or using the premises for an unlawful purpose, thereby terminates the lease, and the landlord, or his or her successor in estate, shall upon service of three days' notice to quit upon the person or persons in possession, be entitled to restitution of possession of the demised premises under this chapter. For purposes of this subdivision, a person who commits an offense described in subdivision (c) of Section 3485 of the Civil Code, or subdivision (c) of Section 3486 of the Civil Code, or uses the premises to further the purpose of that offense shall be deemed to have committed a nuisance upon the premises. For purposes of this subdivision, if a person commits an act of domestic violence as defined in Section 6211 of the Family Code, sexual assault as defined in Section 261, 261.5, 262, 286, 288a, or 289 of the Penal Code, or stalking as defined in Section 1708.7 of the Civil Code, against another tenant or subtenant on the premises there is a rebuttable presumption affecting the burden of proof that the person has committed a nuisance upon the premises, provided, however, that this shall not apply if the victim of the act of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking, or a household member of the victim, other than the perpetrator, has not vacated the premises. This subdivision shall not be construed to supersede the provisions of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-162) that permit the removal from a lease of a tenant who engages in criminal acts of physical violence against cotenants.

- Code of Civil Procedure section 1162~~(a)~~ provides:

(a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), the notices required by Sections 1161 and 1161a may be served by any of the following methods:

(1) By delivering a copy to the tenant personally;

(2) If he or she is absent from his or her place of residence, and from his or her usual place of business, by leaving a copy with some person of suitable age and discretion at either place, and sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at his or her place of residence;

(3) If such place of residence and business can not be ascertained, or a person of suitable age or discretion there can not be found, then by affixing a copy in a conspicuous place on the property, and also delivering a copy to a person there residing, if such person can be found; and also sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at the place where the property is situated. Service upon a subtenant may be made in the same manner.

(b) The notices required by Section 1161 may be served upon a commercial tenant by any of the following methods:

(1) By delivering a copy to the tenant personally.

(2) If he or she is absent from the commercial rental property, by leaving a copy with some person of suitable age and discretion at the property, and sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at the address where the property is situated.

(3) If, at the time of attempted service, a person of suitable age or discretion is not found at the rental property through the exercise of reasonable diligence, then by affixing a copy in a conspicuous place on the property, and also sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at the address where the property is situated. Service upon a subtenant may be made in the same manner.

(c) For purposes of subdivision (b), "commercial tenant" means a person or entity that hires any real property in this state that is not a dwelling unit, as defined in subdivision (c) of Section 1940 of the Civil Code, or a mobilehome, as defined in Section 798.3 of the Civil Code.

- "[T]he service and notice provisions in the unlawful detainer statutes and [Code of Civil Procedure] section 1013 are mutually exclusive, and thus, section 1013 does not extend the notice periods that are a prerequisite to filing an unlawful detainer action." (*Losornio v. Motta* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 110, 112 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 799].)

- "We … hold that service made in accordance with section 1162, subdivision 3, as applied to section 1161, subdivision 2, must be effected in such a manner as will give a tenant the three days of written notice required by the Legislature in which he may cure his default in the payment of rent." (*Davidson, supra,* 138 Cal.App.3d Supp. at p. 14.)

- "We … hold that service of the three-day notice by posting and mailing is effective on the date the notice is posted and mailed." (*Walters, supra,* 226 Cal.App.3d Supp. at p. 20.)

- "It is well settled that the notice required under [Code Civ. Proc., § 1161] subdivisions 2 and 3 (where the condition or covenant assertedly violated is capable of being performed) must be framed in the alternative, viz., pay the rent *or* quit, perform the covenant *or* quit, and a notice which merely directs the tenant to quit is insufficient to render such tenant guilty of unlawful detainer upon his continued possession." (*Hinman v. Wagnon* (1959) 172 Cal.App.2d 24, 27 [341 P.2d 749], original italics.

- "Plaintiff argues, however, that he should be allowed to amend his complaint so as to bring his action under section 1161, subdivision 4. The notice thereunder required need not be framed in the alternative. However, plaintiff has at no time, either by his three days' notice or in any of his pleadings, suggested that defendant had assigned the lease or sublet the property, or had committed waste contrary to the conditions or covenants of the lease, or maintained a nuisance on the premises, or had used the property for an unlawful purpose. Plaintiff had three opportunities to state a cause of action; if he was of the belief that facts

existed which brought his case under 1161, subdivision 4, it would have been a simple matter to allege such facts, but this he did not do." (*Hinman, supra,* 172 Cal.App.2d at p. 29.)

- "Where a covenant in a lease has been breached and the breach cannot be cured, a demand for performance is not a condition precedent to an unlawful detainer action." (*Salton Community Services Dist., supra,* 256 Cal.App.2d at p. 529.)

- "[D]efendant admitted in his answer that he 'ultimately received [the relevant] notice' but 'affirmatively allege[d] that he was not properly and legally served' with a valid notice. We find that, under the circumstances of this case, the defendant waived any defect in the challenged service of the notice under section 1162, subdivision 1." (*Valov, supra,* 168 Cal.App.3d at p. 876.)

- "In commercial leases the landlord and commercial tenant may lawfully agree to notice procedures that differ from those provided in the statutory provisions governing unlawful detainer." (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P., supra*, 185 Cal.App.4th at p.750.)

- "[E]ven if some policy rationale might support such a waiver/forfeiture [by actual receipt] rule in the residential lease context, there is no basis to apply it in the commercial context where matters of service and waiver are prescribed in the lease itself. Nothing in the parties' lease suggests actual receipt of a notice to quit results in the waiver or forfeiture of [tenant]'s right to service accomplished in the manner prescribed. To the contrary, the lease specifically provides, 'No covenant, term or condition, or breach' of the lease 'shall be deemed waived except if expressly waived in a written instrument executed by the waiving party.' Although [tenant's agent] acted on the notice to quit by attempting to deliver the rent check, neither her fortuitous receipt of the notice nor her actions in response to it constitutes an express waiver of the notice provisions in the lease." (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P., supra*, 185 Cal.App.4th at p. 752, internal citation omitted.)

Secondary Sources

12 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2006) Real Property, §§ 720, 723, 727

1 California Landlord-Tenant Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§ 8.26–8.68

1 California Eviction Defense Manual (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§ 5.2, 6.10–6.16, 6.25-6.29, 6.38–6.49, Ch. 8

7 California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 210, *Unlawful Detainer*, §§ 210.21, 210.23, 210.24 (Matthew Bender)

Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Landlord-Tenant Litigation, Ch. 5, *Unlawful Detainer*, 5.11, 5.12

29 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*, § 333.11 (Matthew Bender)

23 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 236, *Unlawful Detainer*, §§ 236.11, 236.12 (Matthew Bender)

Miller & Starr, California Real Estate (Thomson Reuters West) Ch. 19, *Landlord-Tenant*, §§ 19:202-19:204

UNLAWFUL DETAINER

4306. Termination of Month-to-Month Tenancy—Essential Factual Elements

---

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] [and [***name of subtenant***], a subtenant of [***name of defendant***],] no longer [has/have] the right to occupy the property because the tenancy has ended. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***] [owns/leases] the property;**

2. **That [***name of plaintiff***] [rented/subleased] the property to [***name of defendant***] under a month-to-month [lease/rental agreement/sublease];**

3. **That [***name of plaintiff***] gave [***name of defendant***] proper [30/60] days' written notice that the tenancy was ending[, or that [***name of defendant***] actually received this notice at least [30/60] days before [***date on which action was filed***]]; and**

4. **That [***name of defendant***] [or subtenant [***name of subtenant***]] is still occupying the property.**

New August 2007; Revised June 2011

Directions for Use

Uncontested elements may be deleted from this instruction.

Include the bracketed references to a subtenancy in the opening paragraph and in element 4 if persons other than the tenant-defendant are in occupancy of the premises.

If the plaintiff is the landlord or owner, select "owns" in element 1 and "rented" and either "lease" or "rental agreement" in element 2. Commercial documents are usually called "leases" while residential documents are often called "rental agreements." Select the term that is used on the written document.

If the plaintiff is a tenant seeking to recover possession from a subtenant, select "leases" in element 1 and "subleased" and "sublease" in element 2. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1161(3).)

In element 3, select the applicable number of days' notice required by statute. Thirty days is sufficient for commercial tenancies, residential tenancies of less than a year's duration, and certain transfers of the ownership interest to a bona fide purchaser. For residential tenancies of a year or more's duration, 60 days' notice is generally required. (Civ. Code, §§ 1946, 1946.1(b)–(d).)

If service of notice may have been defective, but there is evidence that the defendant actually did receive it, include the bracketed language at the end of element 3. Defective service ~~is~~ may be waived if defendant admits timely receipt of notice. (See *Valov v. Tank* (1985) 168 Cal.App.3d 867, 876 [214 Cal.Rptr. 556]~~*Lehr v. Crosby* (1981) 123 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 6, fn. 3 [177 Cal.Rptr. 96]~~.) If a commercial lease requires service by a particular method, actual receipt by the tenant will not cure the landlord's failure to comply with the service requirements of the lease. (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P. v. Baja Fresh Westlake Village, Inc.* (2010) 185 Cal.App.4th 744, 752 [110 Cal.Rptr.3d 833].) Whether the same rule applies to a residential lease that specifies a method of service has not yet been decided.

Do not give this instruction to terminate a tenancy if the tenant is receiving federal financial assistance through the Section 8 program. (See *Wasatch Property Management v. Degrate* (2005) 35 Cal.4th 1111, 1115 [29 Cal.Rptr.3d 262, 112 P.3d 647]; Civ. Code, § 1954.535 (90 days' notice required).) Specific grounds for terminating a federally subsidized low-income housing tenancy are required and must be set forth in the notice. (See, e.g., 24 C.F.R. § 982.310.)

See CACI No. 4307, *Sufficiency and Service of Notice of Termination of Month-to-Month Tenancy,* for an instruction on proper advanced written notice.

Sources and Authority

- Code of Civil Procedure section 1161 provides, in part:

  A tenant of real property … is guilty of unlawful detainer:

  1. When he or she continues in possession, in person or by subtenant … after the expiration of the term for which it is let to him or her; provided the expiration is of a nondefault nature however brought about without the permission of his or her landlord … including the case where the person to be removed became the occupant of the premises as a servant, employee, agent, or licensee and the relation of master and servant, or employer and employee, or principal and agent, or licensor and licensee, has been lawfully terminated or the time fixed for occupancy by the agreement between the parties has expired; but nothing in this subdivision shall be construed as preventing the removal of the occupant in any other lawful manner; but in case of a tenancy at will, it must first be terminated by notice, as prescribed in the Civil Code.

- Civil Code section 1946 provides: "A hiring of real property, for a term not specified by the parties, is deemed to be renewed as stated in Section 1945, at the end of the term implied by law unless one of the parties gives written notice to the other of his intention to terminate the same, at least as long before the expiration thereof as the term of the hiring itself, not exceeding 30 days; provided, however, that as to tenancies from month to month either of the parties may terminate the same by giving at least 30 days' written notice thereof at any time and the rent shall be due and payable to and including the date of termination. It shall be competent for the parties to provide by an agreement at the time such tenancy is created that a notice of the intention to terminate the same may be given at any time not less than seven

days before the expiration of the term thereof. The notice herein required shall be given in the manner prescribed in Section 1162 of the Code of Civil Procedure or by sending a copy by certified or registered mail addressed to the other party. In addition, the lessee may give such notice by sending a copy by certified or registered mail addressed to the agent of the lessor to whom the lessee has paid the rent for the month prior to the date of such notice or by delivering a copy to the agent personally."

- Civil Code section 1946.1 provides, in part:

  (a) Notwithstanding Section 1946, a hiring of residential real property for a term not specified by the parties, is deemed to be renewed as stated in Section 1945, at the end of the term implied by law unless one of the parties gives written notice to the other of his or her intention to terminate the tenancy, as provided in this section.

  (b) An owner of a residential dwelling giving notice pursuant to this section shall give notice at least 60 days prior to the proposed date of termination. A tenant giving notice pursuant to this section shall give notice for a period at least as long as the term of the periodic tenancy prior to the proposed date of termination.

  (c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b), an owner of a residential dwelling giving notice pursuant to this section shall give notice at least 30 days prior to the proposed date of termination if any tenant or resident has resided in the dwelling for less than one year.

  (d) Notwithstanding subdivision (b), an owner of a residential dwelling giving notice pursuant to this section shall give notice at least 30 days prior to the proposed date of termination if all of the following apply:

    (1) The dwelling or unit is alienable separate from the title to any other dwelling unit.
    (2) The owner has contracted to sell the dwelling or unit to a bona fide purchaser for value, and has established an escrow with a licensed escrow agent, as defined in Sections 17004 and 17200 of the Financial Code, or a licensed real estate broker, as defined in Section 10131 of the Business and Professions Code.
    (3) The purchaser is a natural person or persons.
    (4) The notice is given no more than 120 days after the escrow has been established.
    (5) Notice was not previously given to the tenant pursuant to this section.
    (6) The purchaser in good faith intends to reside in the property for at least one full year after the termination of the tenancy.

    …

  (f) The notices required by this section shall be given in the manner prescribed in Section 1162 of the Code of Civil Procedure or by sending a copy by certified or registered mail.

- Civil Code section 1944 provides: "A hiring of lodgings or a dwelling-house for an unspecified term is presumed to have been made for such length of time as the parties adopt for the estimation of the rent. Thus a hiring at a monthly rate of rent is presumed to be for one month. In the absence of any agreement respecting the length of time or the rent, the hiring is presumed to be monthly."

- Civil Code section 1952.3(a) provides, in part: "[I]f the lessor brings an unlawful detainer proceeding and possession of the property is no longer in issue because possession of the property has been delivered to the lessor before trial or, if there is no trial, before judgment is entered, the case becomes an ordinary civil action … ."

- " 'In order that such an action may be maintained the conventional relation of landlord and tenant must be shown to exist. In other words, the action is limited to those cases in which the tenant is estopped to deny the landlord's title.' " (*Fredericksen v. McCosker* (1956) 143 Cal.App.2d 114, 116 [299 P.2d 908], internal citations omitted.)

- "If the tenant gives up possession of the property after the commencement of an unlawful detainer proceeding, the action becomes an ordinary one for damages." (*Fish Construction Co. v. Moselle Coach Works, Inc.* (1983) 148 Cal.App.3d 654, 658 [196 Cal.Rptr. 174].)

- "The Act provides that as a prerequisite to filing an unlawful detainer action based on a terminated month-to-month tenancy, the landlord must serve the tenant with a 30-day written notice of termination." (*Losornio v. Motta* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 110, 113 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 799], internal citations omitted.)

Secondary Sources

12 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2006) Real Property, § 680

1 California Landlord-Tenant Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§ 8.69–8.80

1 California Eviction Defense Manual (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§ 5.3, 7.5, 7.11

7 California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 210, *Unlawful Detainer*, §§ 210.21, 210.27 (Matthew Bender)

Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Landlord-Tenant Litigation, Ch. 5, *Unlawful Detainer*, 5.07

29 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*, § 333.10 (Matthew Bender)

23 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 236, *Unlawful Detainer*, §§ 236.11, 236.40 (Matthew Bender)

Miller & Starr, California Real Estate (Thomson West) Ch. 19, *Landlord-Tenant*, § 19:188

UNLAWFUL DETAINER

4307. Sufficiency and Service of Notice of Termination of Month-to-Month Tenancy

---

[*Name of plaintiff***] contends that [he/she/it] properly gave [***name of defendant***] written notice that the tenancy was ending. To prove that the notice contained the required information and was properly given, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That the notice informed [***name of defendant***] in writing that the tenancy would end on a date at least [30/60] days after notice was given to [him/her/it];**

2. **That the notice was given to [***name of defendant***] at least [30/60] days before the date that the tenancy was to end; and**

3. **That the notice was given to [***name of defendant***] at least [30/60] days before [***insert date on which action was filed***];**

Notice was properly given if [*select one or more of the following manners of service:***]**

[the notice was delivered to [*name of defendant***] personally~~]~~[./; or]]**

[the notice was sent by certified or registered mail in an envelope addressed to [*name of defendant***], in which case notice is considered given on the date the notice was placed in the mail~~]~~[./; or]]**

[[*name of defendant***] was not at [home or work/the commercial rental property], and the notice was left with a responsible person at [[***name of defendant***]'s home or place of work/the commercial property], and a copy was also mailed ~~to the address of the rented property~~ in an envelope addressed to [***name of defendant***] at [[his/her] residence/the commercial property]. In this case, notice is considered given on the date the second notice was placed in the mail~~]~~[./; or]]**

[for a residential tenancy

[*name of defendant***]'s place of residence and work could not be discovered, or a responsible person could not be found at either place, and (1) the notice was posted on the property in a place where it would easily be noticed, (2) a copy was given to a person living there if someone could be found, and (3) ~~[a responsible person was not present at [***name of defendant***]'s home or work, and the notice was posted on the property in a place where it would easily be noticed, and~~ a copy was also mailed to the property in an envelope addressed to [***name of defendant***]. In this case, notice is considered given on the date the second notice was placed in the mail.]**

[or for a commercial tenancy

at the time of attempted service, a responsible person could not be found at the rental property through the exercise of reasonable diligence, and (1) the notice was posted on the property in a place where it would easily be noticed, and (2) a copy was also mailed to the address of the commercial property in an envelope addressed to [*name of defendant***]. In this case, notice is considered given on the date the second notice was placed in the mail.]**

[The [30/60]-day notice period begins on the day after the notice was given to [*name of defendant***]. If the last day of the notice period falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, [***name of defendant***]'s time to vacate the property is extended to include the first day after the Saturday, Sunday, or holiday that is not also a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday.]**

[If [*name of plaintiff***] did not properly give [***name of defendant***] the required written notice, the notice is still effective if [***name of defendant***] actually received it at least [30/60] days before [***insert date on which action was filed***].]**

New August 2007; Revised December 2010, June 2011

Directions for Use

Select the applicable number of days' notice required by statute. Thirty days is sufficient for commercial tenancies, residential tenancies of less than a year's duration, and certain transfers of the ownership interest to a bona fide purchaser. For residential tenancies of a year or more's duration, 60 days is generally required. (Civ. Code, §§ 1946, 1946.1(b)–(d).)

If 30 days' notice is sufficient and the lease provided for a notice period other than the statutory 30-day period (but not less than 7), insert that number instead of "30" or "60" throughout the instruction. (Civ. Code, § 1946.)

Select all manners of service used, including personal service, certified or registered mail, substituted service by leaving the notice at the defendant's home or place of work or at the rental property, and substituted service by posting on the property. (See Civ. Code, §§ 1946, 1946.1(f); Code Civ. Proc., § 1162~~(a)~~.) ~~Adapt if needed for a commercial tenancy. (See Code Civ. Proc., § 1162(b).)~~

Read the next-to-last paragraph if the last day of the notice period fell on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday.

If service of notice may have been defective, but there is evidence that the defendant actually did receive it, include the last paragraph. Defective service ~~is~~ may be waived if defendant admits timely receipt of notice. (See *Valov v. Tank* (1985) 168 Cal.App.3d 867, 876 [214 Cal.Rptr. 556]~~*Lehr v. Crosby* (1981) 123 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 6, fn. 3 [177 Cal.Rptr. 96]~~.) If a commercial lease requires service by a particular method, actual receipt by the tenant will not cure the landlord's failure to comply with the service requirements of the lease. (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P. v. Baja Fresh Westlake Village, Inc.* (2010) 185 Cal.App.4th 744, 752 [110

Cal.Rptr.3d 833].) Whether the same rule applies to a residential lease that specifies a method of service has not yet been decided.

Local ordinances may impose additional notice requirements for the termination of a rental agreement. This instruction should be modified accordingly.

Sources and Authority

- Civil Code section 1946 provides: "A hiring of real property, for a term not specified by the parties, is deemed to be renewed as stated in Section 1945, at the end of the term implied by law unless one of the parties gives written notice to the other of his intention to terminate the same, at least as long before the expiration thereof as the term of the hiring itself, not exceeding 30 days; provided, however, that as to tenancies from month to month either of the parties may terminate the same by giving at least 30 days' written notice thereof at any time and the rent shall be due and payable to and including the date of termination. It shall be competent for the parties to provide by an agreement at the time such tenancy is created that a notice of the intention to terminate the same may be given at any time not less than seven days before the expiration of the term thereof. The notice herein required shall be given in the manner prescribed in Section 1162 of the Code of Civil Procedure or by sending a copy by certified or registered mail addressed to the other party. In addition, the lessee may give such notice by sending a copy by certified or registered mail addressed to the agent of the lessor to whom the lessee has paid the rent for the month prior to the date of such notice or by delivering a copy to the agent personally."

- Civil Code section 1946.1 provides, in part:

  (a) Notwithstanding Section 1946, a hiring of residential real property for a term not specified by the parties, is deemed to be renewed as stated in Section 1945, at the end of the term implied by law unless one of the parties gives written notice to the other of his or her intention to terminate the tenancy, as provided in this section.

  (b) An owner of a residential dwelling giving notice pursuant to this section shall give notice at least 60 days prior to the proposed date of termination. A tenant giving notice pursuant to this section shall give notice for a period at least as long as the term of the periodic tenancy prior to the proposed date of termination.

  (c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b), an owner of a residential dwelling giving notice pursuant to this section shall give notice at least 30 days prior to the proposed date of termination if any tenant or resident has resided in the dwelling for less than one year.

  (d) Notwithstanding subdivision (b), an owner of a residential dwelling giving notice pursuant to this section shall give notice at least 30 days prior to the proposed date of termination if all of the following apply:

(1) The dwelling or unit is alienable separate from the title to any other dwelling unit.
(2) The owner has contracted to sell the dwelling or unit to a bona fide purchaser for value, and has established an escrow with a licensed escrow agent, as defined in Sections 17004 and 17200 of the Financial Code, or a licensed real estate broker, as defined in Section 10131 of the Business and Professions Code.
(3) The purchaser is a natural person or persons.
(4) The notice is given no more than 120 days after the escrow has been established.
(5) Notice was not previously given to the tenant pursuant to this section.
(6) The purchaser in good faith intends to reside in the property for at least one full year after the termination of the tenancy.
...

(f) The notices required by this section shall be given in the manner prescribed in Section 1162 of the Code of Civil Procedure or by sending a copy by certified or registered mail.

- Code of Civil Procedure section 1162~~(a)~~ provides, in part:

(a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), the notices required … may be served by any of the following methods:

(1) By delivering a copy to the tenant personally;

(2) If he or she is absent from his or her place of residence, and from his or her usual place of business, by leaving a copy with some person of suitable age and discretion at either place, and sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at his or her place of residence;

(3) If such place of residence and business can not be ascertained, or a person of suitable age or discretion there can not be found, then by affixing a copy in a conspicuous place on the property, and also delivering a copy to a person there residing, if such person can be found; and also sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at the place where the property is situated. Service upon a subtenant may be made in the same manner.

(b) The notices required by Section 1161 may be served upon a commercial tenant by any of the following methods:

(1) By delivering a copy to the tenant personally.

(2) If he or she is absent from the commercial rental property, by leaving a copy with some person of suitable age and discretion at the property, and sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at the address where the property is situated.

(3) If, at the time of attempted service, a person of suitable age or discretion is not found at the rental property through the exercise of reasonable diligence, then by affixing a copy in a conspicuous place on the property, and also sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at the address where the property is situated. Service upon a subtenant may be made in the same manner.

(c) For purposes of subdivision (b), "commercial tenant" means a person or entity that hires any real property in this state that is not a dwelling unit, as defined in subdivision (c) of Section 1940 of the Civil Code, or a mobilehome, as defined in Section 798.3 of the Civil Code.

- "[T]he service and notice provisions in the unlawful detainer statutes and [Code of Civil Procedure] section 1013 are mutually exclusive, and thus, section 1013 does not extend the notice periods that are a prerequisite to filing an unlawful detainer action." (*Losornio v. Motta* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 110, 112 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 799].)

- "[D]efendant admitted in his answer that he 'ultimately received [the relevant] notice' but 'affirmatively allege[d] that he was not properly and legally served' with a valid notice. We find that, under the circumstances of this case, the defendant waived any defect in the challenged service of the notice under section 1162, subdivision 1." (*Valov*, *supra*, 168 Cal.App.3d at p. 876.)

- "In commercial leases the landlord and commercial tenant may lawfully agree to notice procedures that differ from those provided in the statutory provisions governing unlawful detainer." (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P.*, *supra*, 185 Cal.App.4th at p.750.)

- "[E]ven if some policy rationale might support such a waiver/forfeiture [by actual receipt] rule in the residential lease context, there is no basis to apply it in the commercial context where matters of service and waiver are prescribed in the lease itself. Nothing in the parties' lease suggests actual receipt of a notice to quit results in the waiver or forfeiture of [tenant]'s right to service accomplished in the manner prescribed. To the contrary, the lease specifically provides, 'No covenant, term or condition, or breach' of the lease 'shall be deemed waived except if expressly waived in a written instrument executed by the waiving party.' Although [tenant's agent] acted on the notice to quit by attempting to deliver the rent check, neither her fortuitous receipt of the notice nor her actions in response to it constitutes an express waiver of the notice provisions in the lease." (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P.*, *supra*, 185 Cal.App.4th at p. 752, internal citation omitted.)

Secondary Sources

12 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2006) Real Property, § 680

1 California Landlord-Tenant Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§ 8.69–8.80

1 California Eviction Defense Manual (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) § 5.3, Ch. 7

7 California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 210, *Unlawful Detainer*, §§ 210.21, 210.27 (Matthew Bender)

Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Landlord-Tenant Litigation, Ch. 5, *Unlawful Detainer*, 5.11, 5.12

29 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*, § 333.11 (Matthew Bender)

23 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 236, *Unlawful Detainer*, §§ 236.10–236.12 (Matthew Bender)

Miller & Starr, California Real Estate (Thomson West) Ch. 19, *Landlord-Tenant*, §§ 19:188, 19:192

UNLAWFUL DETAINER

4308. Termination for Nuisance or Unlawful Use—Essential Factual Elements (Code Civ. Proc, § 1161(4))

[*Name of plaintiff***] claims that [***name of defendant***] [and [***name of subtenant***], a subtenant of [***name of defendant***],] no longer [has/have] the right to occupy the property because [***name of defendant***] has [created a nuisance on the property/ [or] used the property for an illegal purpose]. To establish this claim, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That [***name of plaintiff***] [owns/leases] the property;**

2. **That [***name of plaintiff***] [rented/subleased] the property to [***name of defendant***];**

3. **That [***name of defendant***] [***include one or both of the following:***]**

   created a nuisance on the property by [*specify conduct constituting nuisance***];**

   [or]

   used the property for an illegal purpose by [*specify illegal activity***];**

4. **That [***name of plaintiff***] properly gave [***name of defendant***] [and [***name of subtenant***]] three days' written notice to vacate the property[, or that [***name of defendant***] actually received this notice at least three days before [***date on which action was filed***]]; [and]**

5. **That [***name of defendant***] [or subtenant [***name of subtenant***]] is still occupying the property.**

New December 2010; Revised June 2011

Directions for Use

Uncontested elements may be deleted from this instruction.

Include the bracketed references to a subtenancy in the opening paragraph and in elements 4 and 5 if persons other than the tenant-defendant are in occupancy of the premises.

If the plaintiff is the landlord or owner, select "owns" in element 1, and "rented" in element 2.

If the plaintiff is a tenant seeking to recover possession from a subtenant, include the bracketed language on subtenancy in the opening paragraph and in element 4, "leases" in element 1, and "subleased" in element 2. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1161(3).)

Certain conduct or statutory violations that constitute or create a rebuttable presumption of a nuisance are set forth in Code of Civil Procedure section 1161(4). If applicable, insert the appropriate ground in element 3. (See also Health & Saf. Code, § 17922 [adopting various uniform housing and building codes].)

If service of notice may have been defective, but there is evidence that the defendant actually did receive it, include the bracketed language at the end of element 4. Defective service ~~is~~ may be waived if defendant admits timely receipt of notice. (See *Valov v. Tank* (1985) 168 Cal.App.3d 867, 876 [214 Cal.Rptr. 556]~~*Lehr v. Crosby* (1981) 123 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 6, fn. 3 [177 Cal.Rptr. 96]~~.) If a commercial lease requires service by a particular method, actual receipt by the tenant will not cure the landlord's failure to comply with the service requirements of the lease. (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P. v. Baja Fresh Westlake Village, Inc.* (2010) 185 Cal.App.4th 744, 752 [110 Cal.Rptr.3d 833].) Whether the same rule applies to a residential lease that specifies a method of service has not yet been decided.

If the lease specifies a time period for notice other than the three-day period, substitute that time period in element 4.

For nuisance or unlawful use, the landlord is entitled to possession on service of a three-day notice to quit; no opportunity to cure by performance is required. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1161(4).)

Local or federal law may impose additional requirements for the termination of a rental agreement based on nuisance or illegal activity. This instruction should be modified accordingly.

See CACI No. 4309, *Sufficiency and Service of Notice of Termination for Nuisance or Unlawful Use*, for an instruction on proper written notice.

See also CACI No. 312, *Substantial Performance*.

Sources and Authority

- Code of Civil Procedure section 1161, repealed and replaced with a new version January 1, 2012, provides, in part:

  A tenant of real property … is guilty of unlawful detainer:

  > 4. Any tenant, subtenant, or executor or administrator of his or her estate heretofore qualified and now acting, or hereafter to be qualified and act, assigning or subletting or committing waste upon the demised premises, contrary to the conditions or covenants of his or her lease, or maintaining, committing, or permitting the maintenance or commission of a nuisance upon the demised premises or using the premises for an unlawful purpose, thereby terminates the lease, and the landlord, or his or her successor in estate, shall upon service of three days' notice to quit upon the person or persons in possession, be entitled to restitution of possession of the demised premises under this chapter. For purposes of this subdivision, a person who commits

> an offense described in subdivision (c) of Section 3485 of the Civil Code, or subdivision (c) of Section 3486 of the Civil Code, or uses the premises to further the purpose of that offense shall be deemed to have committed a nuisance upon the premises. For purposes of this subdivision, if a person commits an act of domestic violence as defined in Section 6211 of the Family Code, sexual assault as defined in Section 261, 261.5, 262, 286, 288a, or 289 of the Penal Code, or stalking as defined in Section 1708.7 of the Civil Code, against another tenant or subtenant on the premises there is a rebuttable presumption affecting the burden of proof that the person has committed a nuisance upon the premises, provided, however, that this shall not apply if the victim of the act of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking, or a household member of the victim, other than the perpetrator, has not vacated the premises. This subdivision shall not be construed to supersede the provisions of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-162) that permit the removal from a lease of a tenant who engages in criminal acts of physical violence against cotenants.

- Civil Code section 3479 provides: "Anything which is injurious to health, including, but not limited to, the illegal sale of controlled substances, or is indecent or offensive to the senses, or an obstruction to the free use of property, so as to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property, or unlawfully obstructs the free passage or use, in the customary manner, of any navigable lake, or river, bay, stream, canal, or basin, or any public park, square, street, or highway, is a nuisance."

- "Plaintiff argues, however, that he should be allowed to amend his complaint so as to bring his action under section 1161, subdivision 4. The notice thereunder required need not be framed in the alternative. However, plaintiff has at no time, either by his three days' notice or in any of his pleadings, suggested that defendant had assigned the lease or sublet the property, or had committed waste contrary to the conditions or covenants of the lease, or maintained a nuisance on the premises, or had used the property for an unlawful purpose. Plaintiff had three opportunities to state a cause of action; if he was of the belief that facts existed which brought his case under 1161, subdivision 4, it would have been a simple matter to allege such facts, but this he did not do." (*Hinman v. Wagnon* (1959) 172 Cal.App.2d 24, 29 [341 P.2d 749].)

Secondary Sources

12 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2006) Real Property, § 720 et seq.

1 California Landlord-Tenant Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§

1 California Eviction Defense Manual (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§

7 California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 210, *Unlawful Detainer*, §§ (Matthew Bender)

Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Landlord-Tenant Litigation, Ch. 4, *Termination of Tenancy,* 4.23

29 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*, § 333.10 (Matthew Bender)

23 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 236, *Unlawful Detainer*, § 236.11 (Matthew Bender)

UNLAWFUL DETAINER

4309. Sufficiency and Service of Notice of Termination for Nuisance or Unlawful Use

---

[*Name of plaintiff***] contends that [he/she/it] properly gave [***name of defendant***] three days' notice to vacate the property. To prove that the notice contained the required information and was properly given, [***name of plaintiff***] must prove all of the following:**

1. **That the notice informed [***name of defendant***] in writing that [he/she/it] must vacate the property within three days;**

2. **That the notice described how [***name of defendant***] [created a nuisance on the property/ [or] used the property for an illegal purpose]; and**

3. **That the notice was given to [***name of defendant***] at least three days before [***insert date on which action was filed***].**

Notice was properly given if [*select one or more of the following manners of service:***]**

[the notice was delivered to [*name of defendant***] personally[./; or]]**

~~[or:~~

[[*name of defendant***] was not at [home or work/the commercial rental property], and the notice was left with a responsible person at [[***name of defendant***]'s residence or place of work/the commercial property], and a copy was also mailed ~~to the address of the rented property~~ in an envelope addressed to [***name of defendant***] at [[his/her] residence/the commercial property]. In this case, notice is considered given on the date the second notice was [received by [***name of defendant***]/placed in the mail][./; or]]**

[~~or~~*for a residential tenancy:*

[*name of defendant***]'s place of residence and work could not be discovered, or a responsible person could not be found at either place, and (1) the notice was posted on the property in a place where it would easily be noticed, (2) a copy was given to a person living there if someone could be found, and (3)~~a responsible person was not present at [*name of defendant*]'s residence or work, and the notice was posted on the property in a place where it would easily be noticed, and~~ a copy was also mailed to the address of the rented property in an envelope addressed to [***name of defendant***]. In this case, notice is considered given on the date the second notice was [received by [***name of defendant***]/placed in the mail].]**

[*or for a commercial tenancy:*

at the time of attempted service, a responsible person could not be found at the rental property through the exercise of reasonable diligence, and (1) the notice was posted on the property in a place where it would easily be noticed, and (2) a copy was also mailed to the address of the commercial property in an envelope addressed to [*name of defendant***]. In this case, notice is considered given on the date the second notice was [received by [***name of defendant***]/placed in the mail].]**

[The three-day notice period begins on the day after the notice was given to [*name of defendant***]. If the last day of the notice period falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, [***name of defendant***]'s time to correct the failure or to vacate the property is extended to include the first day after the Saturday, Sunday, or holiday that is not also a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday.]**

[If [*name of plaintiff***] did not properly give [***name of defendant***] the required written notice, the notice is still effective if [***name of defendant***] actually received it at least three days before [***insert date on which action was filed***].]**

New December 2010; Revised June 2011

Directions for Use

Select the manner of service used; personal service, substituted service by leaving the notice at the defendant's home or place of work or at the commercial property, or substituted service by posting on the property. (See Code Civ. Proc., § 1162~~(a)~~.) ~~Adapt if needed for a commercial tenancy. (See Code Civ. Proc., § 1162(b).)~~

There is a conflict in the case law with respect to when the three-day period begins if substituted service is used. Compare *Davidson v. Quinn* (1982) 138 Cal.App.3d Supp. 9, 14 [188 Cal.Rptr. 421] [tenant must be given three days to pay, so period does not begin until actual notice is received] with *Walters v. Meyers* (1990) 226 Cal.App.3d Supp. 15, 19–20 [277 Cal.Rptr. 316] [notice is effective when posted and mailed]. This conflict is accounted for in the second, ~~and~~ third, and fourth bracketed options for the manner of service.

Read the next-to-last paragraph if the last day of the notice period fell on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday.

If a lease specifies a time period for giving notice other than the three-day period, substitute that time period for three days throughout the instruction, provided that it is not less than three days.

If service of notice may have been defective, but there is evidence that the defendant actually did receive it, include the last paragraph. Defective service ~~is~~ may be waived if defendant admits timely receipt of notice. (See *Valov v. Tank* (1985) 168 Cal.App.3d 867, 876 [214 Cal.Rptr. 556]~~*Lehr v. Crosby* (1981) 123 Cal.App.3d Supp. 1, 6, fn. 3 [177 Cal.Rptr. 96]~~.) If a commercial lease requires service by a particular method, actual receipt by the tenant will not cure the landlord's failure to comply with the service requirements of the lease. (*Culver Center Partners*

East #1, L.P. v. Baja Fresh Westlake Village, Inc. (2010) 185 Cal.App.4th 744, 752 [110 Cal.Rptr.3d 833].) Whether the same rule applies to a residential lease that specifies a method of service has not yet been decided.

Local ordinances may impose additional notice requirements for the termination of a rental agreement. This instruction should be modified accordingly.

Sources and Authority

- Code of Civil Procedure section 1161, repealed and replaced with a new version January 1, 2012, provides, in part:

  A tenant of real property … is guilty of unlawful detainer:

  4. Any tenant, subtenant, or executor or administrator of his or her estate heretofore qualified and now acting, or hereafter to be qualified and act, assigning or subletting or committing waste upon the demised premises, contrary to the conditions or covenants of his or her lease, or maintaining, committing, or permitting the maintenance or commission of a nuisance upon the demised premises or using the premises for an unlawful purpose, thereby terminates the lease, and the landlord, or his or her successor in estate, shall upon service of three days' notice to quit upon the person or persons in possession, be entitled to restitution of possession of the demised premises under this chapter. For purposes of this subdivision, a person who commits an offense described in subdivision (c) of Section 3485 of the Civil Code, or subdivision (c) of Section 3486 of the Civil Code, or uses the premises to further the purpose of that offense shall be deemed to have committed a nuisance upon the premises. For purposes of this subdivision, if a person commits an act of domestic violence as defined in Section 6211 of the Family Code, sexual assault as defined in Section 261, 261.5, 262, 286, 288a, or 289 of the Penal Code, or stalking as defined in Section 1708.7 of the Civil Code, against another tenant or subtenant on the premises there is a rebuttable presumption affecting the burden of proof that the person has committed a nuisance upon the premises, provided, however, that this shall not apply if the victim of the act of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking, or a household member of the victim, other than the perpetrator, has not vacated the premises. This subdivision shall not be construed to supersede the provisions of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-162) that permit the removal from a lease of a tenant who engages in criminal acts of physical violence against cotenants.

- Code of Civil Procedure section 1162~~(a)~~ provides:

(a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), the notices required by Sections 1161 and 1161a may be served by any of the following methods:

(1) By delivering a copy to the tenant personally;

(2) If he or she is absent from his or her place of residence, and from his or her usual place of business, by leaving a copy with some person of suitable age and discretion at either place, and sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at his or her place of residence;

(3) If such place of residence and business can not be ascertained, or a person of suitable age or discretion there can not be found, then by affixing a copy in a conspicuous place on the property, and also delivering a copy to a person there residing, if such person can be found; and also sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at the place where the property is situated. Service upon a subtenant may be made in the same manner.

(b) The notices required by Section 1161 may be served upon a commercial tenant by any of the following methods:

(1) By delivering a copy to the tenant personally.

(2) If he or she is absent from the commercial rental property, by leaving a copy with some person of suitable age and discretion at the property, and sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at the address where the property is situated.

(3) If, at the time of attempted service, a person of suitable age or discretion is not found at the rental property through the exercise of reasonable diligence, then by affixing a copy in a conspicuous place on the property, and also sending a copy through the mail addressed to the tenant at the address where the property is situated. Service upon a subtenant may be made in the same manner.

(c) For purposes of subdivision (b), "commercial tenant" means a person or entity that hires any real property in this state that is not a dwelling unit, as defined in subdivision (c) of Section 1940 of the Civil Code, or a mobilehome, as defined in Section 798.3 of the Civil Code.

- "[T]he service and notice provisions in the unlawful detainer statutes and [Code of Civil Procedure] section 1013 are mutually exclusive, and thus, section 1013 does not extend the notice periods that are a prerequisite to filing an unlawful detainer action." (*Losornio v. Motta* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 110, 112 [78 Cal.Rptr.2d 799].)

- "We … hold that service made in accordance with section 1162, subdivision 3, as applied to section 1161, subdivision 2, must be effected in such a manner as will give a tenant the three days of written notice required by the Legislature in which he may cure his default in the payment of rent." (*Davidson, supra,* 138 Cal.App.3d Supp. at p. 14.)

- "We … hold that service of the three-day notice by posting and mailing is effective on the date the notice is posted and mailed." (*Walters, supra,* 226 Cal.App.3d Supp. at p. 20.)

- "Plaintiff argues, however, that he should be allowed to amend his complaint so as to bring his action under section 1161, subdivision 4. The notice thereunder required need not be framed in the alternative. However, plaintiff has at no time, either by his three days' notice or in any of his pleadings, suggested that defendant had assigned the lease or sublet the property, or had committed waste contrary to the conditions or covenants of the lease, or maintained a nuisance on the premises, or had used the property for an unlawful purpose. Plaintiff had three opportunities to state a cause of action; if he was of the belief that facts existed which brought his case under 1161, subdivision 4, it would have been a simple matter to allege such facts, but this he did not do." (*Hinman v. Wagnon* (1959) 172 Cal.App.2d 24, 29 [341 P.2d 749].)

- "[D]efendant admitted in his answer that he 'ultimately received [the relevant] notice' but 'affirmatively allege[d] that he was not properly and legally served' with a valid notice. We find that, under the circumstances of this case, the defendant waived any defect in the challenged service of the notice under section 1162, subdivision 1." (*Valov, supra*, 168 Cal.App.3d at p. 876.)

- "In commercial leases the landlord and commercial tenant may lawfully agree to notice procedures that differ from those provided in the statutory provisions governing unlawful detainer." (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P., supra*, 185 Cal.App.4th at p.750.)

- "[E]ven if some policy rationale might support such a waiver/forfeiture [by actual receipt] rule in the residential lease context, there is no basis to apply it in the commercial context where matters of service and waiver are prescribed in the lease itself. Nothing in the parties' lease suggests actual receipt of a notice to quit results in the waiver or forfeiture of [tenant]'s right to service accomplished in the manner prescribed. To the contrary, the lease specifically provides, 'No covenant, term or condition, or breach' of the lease 'shall be deemed waived except if expressly waived in a written instrument executed by the waiving party.' Although [tenant's agent] acted on the notice to quit by attempting to deliver the rent check, neither her fortuitous receipt of the notice nor her actions in response to it constitutes an express waiver of the notice provisions in the lease." (*Culver Center Partners East #1, L.P., supra*, 185 Cal.App.4th at p. 752, internal citation omitted.)

Secondary Sources

12 Witkin, Summary of California Law (10th ed. 2006) Real Property, § 720 et seq.

1 California Landlord-Tenant Practice (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§

1 California Eviction Defense Manual (Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed.) §§

7 California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 210, *Unlawful Detainer*, § 210.24 (Matthew Bender)

Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Landlord-Tenant Litigation, Ch. 4, *Termination of Tenancy*, 4.23

29 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*, § 333.10 (Matthew Bender)

23 California Points and Authorities, Ch. 236, *Unlawful Detainer*, § 236.11 (Matthew Bender)

5000. Duties of the Judge and Jury

Members of the jury, you have now heard all the evidence [and the closing arguments of the attorneys]. [The attorneys will have one last chance to talk to you in closing argument. But before they do, it] [It] is my duty to instruct you on the law that applies to this case. You must follow these instructions [as well as those that I previously gave you]. You will have a copy of my instructions with you when you go to the jury room to deliberate. [I have provided each of you with your own copy of the instructions.] [I will display each instruction on the screen.]

You must decide what the facts are. You must consider all the evidence and then decide what you think happened. You must decide the facts based on the evidence admitted in this trial.

Do not allow anything that happens outside this courtroom to affect your decision. Do not talk about this case or the people involved in it with anyone, including family and persons living in your household, friends and coworkers, spiritual leaders, advisors, or therapists. Do not do any research on your own or as a group. Do not use dictionaries~~, the Internet,~~ or other reference materials.

These prohibitions on communications and research extend to all forms of electronic communications. Do not use any electronic devices or media, such as a cell phone or smart phone, PDA, computer, the Internet, any Internet service, any text or instant-messaging service, any Internet chat room, blog, or Web site, including social networking websites or online diaries, to send or receive any information to or from anyone about this case or your experience as a juror until after you have been discharged from your jury duty.

Do not investigate the case or conduct any experiments. Do not contact anyone to assist you, such as a family accountant, doctor, or lawyer. Do not visit or view the scene of any event involved in this case. If you happen to pass by the scene, do not stop or investigate. All jurors must see or hear the same evidence at the same time. [Do not read, listen to, or watch any news accounts of this trial.] You must not let bias, sympathy, prejudice, or public opinion influence your decision.

I will now tell you the law that you must follow to reach your verdict. You must follow the law exactly as I give it to you, even if you disagree with it. If the attorneys [have said/say] anything different about what the law means, you must follow what I say.

In reaching your verdict, do not guess what I think your verdict should be from something I may have said or done.

Pay careful attention to all the instructions that I give you. All the instructions are important because together they state the law that you will use in this case. You must consider all of the instructions together.

After you have decided what the facts are, you may find that some instructions do not apply. In that case, follow the instructions that do apply and use them together with the facts to reach your verdict.

If I repeat any ideas or rules of law during my instructions, that does not mean that these ideas or

rules are more important than the others. In addition, the order in which the instructions are given does not make any difference.

[Most of the instructions are typed. However, some handwritten or typewritten words may have been added, and some words may have been deleted. Do not discuss or consider why words may have been added or deleted. Please treat all the words the same, no matter what their format. Simply accept the instruction in its final form.]

New September 2003; Revised April 2004, October 2004, February 2005, December 2009, June 2011

Directions for Use

As indicated by the brackets in the first paragraph, this instruction can be read either before or after closing arguments. The advisory committee recommends that this instruction be read to the jury before reading instructions on the substantive law.

Sources and Authority

- Code of Civil Procedure section 608 provides that "[i]n charging the jury the court may state to them all matters of law which it thinks necessary for their information in giving their verdict." It also provides that the court "must inform the jury that they are the exclusive judges of all questions of fact." (See also Code Civ. Proc., § 592.)

- Evidence Code section 312(a) provides that "[e]xcept as otherwise provided by law, where the trial is by jury [a]ll questions of fact are to be decided by the jury."

- An instruction to disregard any appearance of bias on the part of the judge is proper. (*Gist v. French* (1955) 136 Cal.App.2d 247, 257-259 [288 P.2d 1003], disapproved on other grounds in *Deshotel v. Atchinson, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co.* (1958) 50 Cal.2d 664, 667 [328 P.2d 449] and *West v. City of San Diego* (1960) 54 Cal.2d 469, 478-479 [6 Cal.Rptr. 289, 353 P.2d 929].)

- Jurors must avoid bias: " 'The right to unbiased and unprejudiced jurors is an inseparable and inalienable part of the right to trial by jury guaranteed by the constitution.' " (*Weathers v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 98, 110 [95 Cal.Rptr. 516, 485 P.2d 1132], internal citations omitted.) Evidence of racial prejudice and bias on the part of jurors amounts to misconduct and may constitute grounds for ordering a new trial. (*Ibid*.)

- An instruction to consider all the instructions together can help avoid instructional errors of conflict, omission, and undue emphasis. (*Escamilla v. Marshburn Brothers* (1975) 48 Cal.App.3d 472, 484 [121 Cal.Rptr. 891].)

- Providing an instruction stating that, depending on what the jury finds to be the facts, some of the instructions may not apply can help avoid reversal on the grounds of misleading jury instructions. (See *Rodgers v. Kemper Construction Co.* (1975) 50 Cal.App.3d 608, 629–630 [124 Cal.Rptr. 143].)

- In *Bertero v. National General Corp.* (1974) 13 Cal.3d 43, 57–59 [118 Cal.Rptr. 184, 529 P.2d 608], the Supreme Court held that the giving of cautionary instructions stating that no undue emphasis was intended by repetition and that the judge did not intend to imply how any issue should be decided, ought to be considered in weighing the net effect of the instructions on the jury.

Secondary Sources

7 Witkin, California Procedure (4th ed. 1997) Trial, § 268

4 California Trial Guide, Unit 91, *Jury Deliberations and Rendition of Verdict*, § 91.20 (Matthew Bender)

28 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 326, *Jury Instructions*, § 326.21 (Matthew Bender)

5009. Predeliberation Instructions

When you go to the jury room, the first thing you should do is choose a presiding juror. The presiding juror should see to it that your discussions are orderly and that everyone has a fair chance to be heard.

It is your duty to talk with one another in the jury room and to consider the views of all the jurors. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but only after you have considered the evidence with the other members of the jury. Feel free to change your mind if you are convinced that your position should be different. You should all try to agree. But do not give up your honest beliefs just because the others think differently.

Please do not state your opinions too strongly at the beginning of your deliberations or immediately announce how you plan to vote as it may interfere with an open discussion. Keep an open mind so that you and your fellow jurors can easily share ideas about the case.

You should use your common sense, but do not use or consider any special training or unique personal experience that any of you have in matters involved in this case. Your training or experience is not a part of the evidence received in this case.

Sometimes jurors disagree or have questions about the evidence or about what the witnesses said in their testimony. If that happens, you may ask to have testimony read back to you [or ask to see any exhibits admitted into evidence that have not already been provided to you]. Also, jurors may need further explanation about the laws that apply to the case. If this happens during your discussions, write down your questions and give them to the [clerk/bailiff/court attendant]. I will talk with the attorneys before I answer so it may take some time. You should continue your deliberations while you wait for my answer. I will do my best to answer them. When you write me a note, do not tell me how you voted on an issue until I ask for this information in open court.

[At least nine jurors must agree on a verdict. When you have finished filling out the form, your presiding juror must write the date and sign it at the bottom and then notify the [bailiff/clerk/court attendant] that you are ready to present your verdict in the courtroom.]

Your decision must be based on your personal evaluation of the evidence presented in the case. Each of you may be asked in open court how you voted on each question.

While I know you would not do this, I am required to advise you that you must not base your decision on chance, such as a flip of a coin. If you decide to award damages, you may not agree in advance to simply add up the amounts each juror thinks is right and then, without further deliberations, make the average your verdict.

You may take breaks, but do not discuss this case with anyone, including each other, until all of you are back in the jury room.

New September 2003; Revised April 2004, October 2004, February 2007, December 2009, June 2011

Directions for Use

The advisory committee recommends that this instruction be read to the jury after closing arguments and after reading instructions on the substantive law.

Read the sixth paragraph if a general verdict form is to be used. If a special verdict will be used, give CACI No. 5012, *Introduction to Special Verdict Form*.

Judges may want to provide each juror with a copy of the verdict form so that the jurors can use it to keep track of how they vote. Jurors can be instructed that this copy is for their personal use only and that the presiding juror will be given the official verdict form to record the jury's decision. Judges may also want to advise jurors that they may be polled in open court regarding their individual verdicts.

Delete the reference to reading back testimony if the proceedings are not being recorded.

Sources and Authority

- Code of Civil Procedure section 613 provides, in part: "When the case is finally submitted to the jury, they may decide in court or retire for deliberation; if they retire, they must be kept together, in some convenient place, under charge of an officer, until at least three-fourths of them agree upon a verdict or are discharged by the court."

- Code of Civil Procedure section 614 provides: "After the jury have retired for deliberation, if there be a disagreement between them as to any part of the testimony, or if they desire to be informed of any point of law arising in the cause, they may require the officer to conduct them into court. Upon their being brought into court, the information required must be given in the presence of, or after notice to, the parties or counsel."

- Code of Civil Procedure section 618 and article I, section 16, of the California Constitution provide that three-fourths of the jurors must agree to a verdict in a civil case.

- ~~The prohibition on chance or quotient verdict is stated in~~ Code of Civil Procedure section 657 provides in part:

  > The verdict may be vacated and any other decision may be modified or vacated, in whole or in part, and a new or further trial granted on all or part of the issues, on the application of the party aggrieved, for any of the following causes, materially affecting the substantial rights of such party:
  >
  > 1. [omitted]

2. Misconduct of the jury; and whenever any one or more of the jurors have been induced to assent to any general or special verdict, or to a finding on any question submitted to them by the court, by a resort to the determination of chance, such misconduct may be proved by the affidavit of any one of the jurors.

- "Chance is the 'hazard, risk, or the result or issue of uncertain and unknown conditions or forces.' Verdicts reached by tossing a coin, drawing lots, or any other form of gambling are examples of improper chance verdicts. 'The more sophisticated device of the quotient verdict is equally improper: The jurors agree to be bound by an average of their views; each writes the amount he favors on a slip of paper; the sums are added and divided by 12, and the resulting "quotient" pursuant to the prior agreement, is accepted as the verdict without further deliberation or consideration of its fairness.' ", ~~which provides that a verdict may be vacated and a new trial ordered "whenever any one or more of the jurors have been induced to assent to any general or special verdict, or to a finding on any question submitted to them by the court, by a resort to the determination of chance.~~" (~~See also~~ *Chronakis v. Windsor* (1993) 14 Cal.App.4th 1058, 1064–1065 [18 Cal.Rptr.2d 106].)

- " '[T]here is no impropriety in the jurors making an average of their individual estimates as to the amount of damages for the purpose of arriving at a basis for discussion and consideration, nor in adopting such average if it is subsequently agreed to by the jurors; but to agree beforehand to adopt such average and abide by the agreement, without further discussion or deliberation, is fatal to the verdict.' " (*Chronakis, supra*, 14 Cal.App.4th at p. 1066.)

- Jurors should be encouraged to deliberate on the case. (*Vomaska v. City of San Diego* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 905, 911 [64 Cal.Rptr.2d 492].)

- The jurors may properly be advised of the duty to hear and consider each other's arguments with open minds, rather than preventing agreement by stubbornly sticking to their first impressions. (*Cook v. Los Angeles Ry. Corp.* (1939) 13 Cal.2d 591, 594 [91 P.2d 118].)

- "The trial court properly denied the motion for new trial on the ground that [the plaintiff] did not demonstrate the jury reached a chance or quotient verdict. The jury agreed on a high and a low figure and, before calculating an average, they further agreed to adjust downward the high figure and to adjust upward the low figure. There is no evidence that this average was adopted without further consideration or that the jury agreed at any time to adopt an average and abide by the agreement without further discussion or deliberation." (*Lara v. Nevitt* (2004) 123 Cal.App.4th 454, 462–463 [19 Cal.Rptr.3d 865].)

Secondary Sources

7 Witkin, California Procedure (4th ed. 1997) Trial, §§ 330, 336

4 California Trial Guide, Unit 91, *Jury Deliberations and Rendition of Verdict*, § 91.01 (Matthew Bender)

28 California Forms of Pleading and Practice, Ch. 326, *Jury Instructions*, § 326.32, Ch. 326A, *Jury Verdicts*, § 326A.14 (Matthew Bender)

5019. Questions From Jurors

If, during the trial, any of you had a question that you believed should be asked of a witness, you were instructed to write out the question and provide it to me through my courtroom staff. I shared your questions with the attorneys, after which, I decided whether the question could be asked.

If a question was asked and answered, you are to consider the answer as you would any other evidence received in the trial. Do not give the answer any greater or less weight because it was initiated by a juror question.

If the question was not asked, do not speculate as to what the answer might have been or why it was not asked. There are many legal reasons why a suggested question cannot be asked of a witness. Give the question no further consideration.

New June 2011

Directions for Use

This is an optional instruction for use if the jurors will be allowed to ask questions of the witnesses. For a similar instruction to be given at the beginning of the trial, see CACI No. 112, *Questions From Jurors*. This instruction may be modified to account for an individual judge's practice.

Sources and Authority

- Rule 2.1033 of the California Rules of Court provides: "A trial judge should allow jurors to submit written questions directed to witnesses. An opportunity must be given to counsel to object to such questions out of the presence of the jury."

- "In a proper case there may be a real benefit from allowing jurors to submit questions under proper control by the court. However, in order to permit the court to exercise its discretion and maintain control of the trial, the correct procedure is to have the juror write the questions for consideration by the court and counsel prior to their submission to the witness." (*People v. McAlister* (1985) 167 Cal.App.3d 633, 644 [213 Cal.Rptr. 271].)

- "[T]he judge has discretion to ask questions submitted by jurors or to pass those questions on and leave to the discretion of counsel whether to ask the questions." (*People v. Cummings* (1993) 4 Cal.4th 1233, 1305 [18 Cal.Rptr.2d 796, 850 P.2d 1].)

- "The appellant urges that when jurymen ask improper questions the defendant is placed in the delicate dilemma of either allowing such question to go in without objection or of offending the jurors by making the objection and the appellant insists that the court of its own motion should check the putting of such improper questions by the jurymen, and thus relieve the party injuriously affected thereby from the odium which might result from making that objection thereto. There is no force in this contention. Objections to questions, whether asked by a juror or by opposing counsel, are

presented to the court, and its ruling thereon could not reasonably affect the rights or standing of the party making the objection before the jury in the one case more than in the other." (*Maris v. H. Crummey, Inc.* (1921) 55 Cal.App. 573, 578–579 [204 P. 259].)

Secondary Sources

3 Witkin, California Evidence (4th ed. 2000) Presentation at Trial, § 85

4 California Trial Guide, Unit 91, *Jury Deliberations and Rendition of Verdict*, §§ 91.01–91.03 (Matthew Bender)