

# Appendix.

## **Exhibit 1.**

The Order of the Court of Appeal for the  
First District, November 06, 2018.

**COPY**

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FOUR

TATYANA E. DREVALEVA,

Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL  
RELATIONS, DIVISION OF LABOR  
STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT,

Defendant and Respondent.

Court of Appeal, First Appellate District  
**FILED**  
NOV -6 2018  
Charles D. Johnson, Clerk  
by Deputy Clerk

A155090, A155165, A155187

(Alameda County  
Super. Ct. No. RG17881790)

THE COURT:

Appellant, proceeding in propria persona, has filed three appeals challenging orders entered by the trial court in her underlying action against respondent. No. A155090 challenges a July 27, 2018 trial court order denying a motion for reconsideration of an order denying a motion to conduct specified discovery during the pendency of an anti-SLAPP motion to strike filed by respondent. (See Code Civ. Proc., § 425.16, subd. (g).) No. A155165 challenges orders entered on August 17, 2018, including an order granting respondent's anti-SLAPP motion in part and an order sustaining respondent's demurrer without leave to amend. No. A155187 challenges a May 18, 2018 order denying Drevaleva's motion to conduct discovery during the pendency of the anti-SLAPP motion. Briefing has not commenced in these appeals.

Respondent has filed a motion to dismiss appeal No. A155090. Appellant concedes the order challenged in that appeal (the order denying reconsideration) is not separately appealable (see Code Civ. Proc., § 1008, subd. (g)), and she has filed in the trial court an abandonment of that appeal. But she opposes the granting of the motion to dismiss, partly on grounds of allegedly defective service of the motion. Appellant also

has filed a request to file a supplemental brief in connection with the motion to dismiss, as well as a request for a hearing on the motion.

In addition, appellant has filed motions or requests (1) to consolidate her three appeals, (2) for calendar preference, (3) to “shorten time,” which we construe as also seeking calendar preference, and (4) for “substituted service,” allowing a friend to appear on her behalf at respondent’s office to receive certain documents on a specified date that has since passed (a date in September 2018). Respondent did not file an opposition to any of these motions.

After due consideration, this court rules as follows:

1. Respondent’s motion to dismiss appeal No. A155090 is granted. The challenged order denying reconsideration is not separately appealable. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1008, subd. (g).) Any defect in service of the motion did not prejudice appellant, as she received the motion and responded to it. Appellant’s requests to file a supplemental brief in connection with the motion to dismiss and for a hearing on the motion are denied. The dismissal of appeal No. A155090 is without prejudice to (1) appellant’s ability to pursue her other appeals (Nos. A155165 and A155187) and to raise any appropriate arguments in those appeals, and (2) respondent’s ability to present any challenges to the viability or merits of those appeals. We express no opinion as to any issue concerning the viability or merits of appeal Nos. A155165 and A155187.
2. Appellant’s unopposed motion to consolidate is granted as to appeal Nos. A155165 and A155187. Those two appeals are consolidated for purposes of record preparation, briefing, any oral argument and decision.
3. Appellant’s motions for calendar preference and to “shorten time” are denied due to an insufficient showing of good cause.
4. Appellant’s request for “substituted service” of certain documents on a specified date in September 2018 is denied as moot, as the pickup of documents presumably has already occurred.

(Streeter, Acting P.J., Tucher, J., and Lee, J.\* participated in the decision.)

NOV - 6 2018

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

STREETER, ACTING P.J.

ACTING  
P.J.

---

\* Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.

## **Exhibit 2.**

The Order of the Supreme Court of California dated January 23, 2019.

Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Four - Nos. A155165, A155187

S252888

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA**

**En Banc**

**SUPREME COURT  
FILED**

---

JAN 23 2019

TATYANA E. DREVALEVA, Plaintiff and Appellant,

Jorge Navarrete Clerk

v.

---

Deputy

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, DIVISION OF LABOR  
STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT, Defendant and Respondent.

---

AND CONSOLIDATED CASE.

---

The petition for review is denied.

**CANTIL-SAKAUYE**  
*Chief Justice*

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**