MICHAEL A. CONGER, ESQUIRE (State Bar #147882) LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL A. CONGER 16236 San Dieguito Road, Suite 4-14 Mailing: P.O. Box 9374 Rancho Santa Fe, California 92067 Telephone: (858) 759-0200 Facsimile: (858) 759-1906 4 5 Attorney for all Plaintiffs, individually, and CLERK - SUPERIOR COURT SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA on behalf of all others similarly situated 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO 10 DONALD R. SHORT, JAMES F. GLEASON, CASE NO: GIC877707 CASEY MEEHAN, MARILYN SHORT, PATTY WESTERVELT, AND DOTTIE YELLE, 11 Date: August 17, 2007 individually, and on behalf of all others similarly Time: 10:30 a.m. 12 situated, Judge: Hon. Yuri Hofmann Dept: 60 13 Plaintiffs, Action Filed: December 29, 2006 Trial Date: Not yet set 14 15 PLAINTIFFS' REQUEST FOR CC-LA JOLLA, Inc., a Delaware Corporation, CC-LA JOLLA, L.L.C., a Delaware limited liability TRIAL PREFERENCE 16 company, CC-DEVELOPMENT GROUP, INC., CLASSIC RESIDENCE MANAGEMENT [C.C.P.  $\S 36(a)$ ] 17 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, an Illinois Limited Partnership, and DOES 1 to 110, inclusive, 18 Defendants. 19 20 Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 36, subdivision (a), plaintiffs Donald R. 21 22 Short and James F. Gleason respectfully request that this Court set this case for trial within 120 days of the case management conference, or no later than December 17, 2007. In support of this 23 24 request, plaintiffs state: Section 36, subdivision (a) provides: 25 1. "A party to a civil action who is over the age of 70 years may 26 27 All further statutory references will be to the Code of Civil Procedure unless 28

otherwise stated.

petition the court for a preference, which the court shall grant if the court makes all of the following findings:

- (1) The party has a substantial interest in the action as a whole.
- The health of the party is such that a preference is necessary to prevent prejudicing the party's interest in the litigation."

Here, plaintiffs Donald R. Short (age 85) and James F. Gleason (age 80) each have a substantial interest in the litigation and each suffers from medical conditions that will increasingly prevent their full participation and attendance at trial the longer it takes to commence trial.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. Section 36.5 provides:

"An affidavit submitted in support of a motion for preference under subdivision (a) of Section 36 may be signed by the attorney for the party seeking preference based upon information and belief as to the medical diagnosis and prognosis of any party. The affidavit is not admissible for any purpose other than a motion for preference under subdivision (a) of Section 36."

3. In their leading treatise, Judges Weil and Brown state:

"The attorney's declaration can consist entirely of hearsay and conclusions! . . . . The attorney's declaration cannot be used for any other purpose. . . . [I]t is a one-of-a-kind exception to the normal rule that declarations must contain *admissible evidence*, not hearsay or conclusions []." (Weil & Brown, Cal. Prac. Guide: Civil Proc. Before Trial (The Rutter Group 2007) ["Weil & Brown"], at pp. 12(I)-40, 41, ¶¶ 12:247.1-12:247.2, italics in original.)

4. The request for a preference need not be made by noticed motion, and is typically made at the case management conference.

"Procedure for claiming preference: The preference issue can be raised at the case management conference (CRC 2.727(12)) . . . . In setting the trial date, the court must take into account a party's right to a preference. (CRC 3.729(2)." (Weil & Brown, supra, p. 12(1)-40 at ¶ 12:246.4.)

In fact, the "Case Management Statement" promulgated in a form adopted for mandatory use by the Judicial Council of California, form number CM-110, includes at question number 9, page 2,

See the accompanying Declaration of Michael A. Conger, at paragraphs 2 and 3.