

SUPREME COURT  
FILED

Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One - No. B283658  
MAY 22 2019  
S255259  
Jorge Navarrete Clerk

Deputy

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA**

**En Banc**

VICKI CORONA, Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

MARYAM GASPARYAN, Defendant and Respondent.

The petition for review is denied.

CANTIL-SAKAUYE

*Chief Justice*

" A "

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SEVEN

VICKI CORONA,

Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

MARIYAM GASPARYAN,

Defendant and Respondent.

**COURT OF APPEAL - SECOND DIST.**

**FILED**

Feb 21, 2019

DANIEL P. POTTER, Clerk

B283658

izelaya Deputy Clerk

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. BC577738)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Charles F. Palmer, Judge. Dismissed.

Vicki Corona, in pro. per., for Plaintiff and Appellant.

Law Offices of Dan D. Endoso & Associates and Andrea Torosyan for Defendant and Respondent.

B

Plaintiff Vicki Corona appeals from a judgment entered in favor of defendant Mariyam Gasparyan following a court trial. We conclude the appeal must be dismissed because Corona failed to timely file her notice of appeal.

## DISCUSSION

Corona and Charles Hodges filed this action against Gasparyan for damages arising from a motor vehicle accident. Hodges dismissed his case before trial. Following trial, the court found Corona, who represented herself at trial, had failed to meet her burden of proof, and there was no evidence of causation of damages. The court entered judgment on March 21, 2017.

Corona's notice of appeal was dated May 16, 2017; it had a proof of service dated May 19, 2017. However, it was stamped received and filed in the superior court on June 30, 2017.

On October 3, 2018, we sent the parties a letter pursuant to Government Code section 68081, requesting additional briefing addressing the question whether Corona's notice of appeal was untimely and therefore the appeal must be dismissed.

We explained: The judgment of dismissal was entered on March 21, 2017. The case summary indicated that notice of entry of judgment was filed on March 21, 2017. Corona filed her notice of appeal on June 30, 2017, 101 days later. California Rules of Court, rule 8.104(a)(1) provides that a notice of appeal must be filed within 60 days of service of the notice of entry of judgment. This time limit is mandatory and jurisdictional. (*Ellis v. Ellis* (2015) 235 Cal.App.4th 837, 842.) "If a notice of appeal is filed late, the reviewing court must dismiss the appeal." (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.104(b).)

Corona submitted a response to our letter stating that she mailed her notice of appeal to the court and Gasparyan's trial counsel, Sheryl Reeves, on May 19, 2017. She supported this with a post office receipt for stamps dated May 19 and the last page of a notice of appeal stating that it was served on Reeves by mail on May 19.

Corona explained that her notice of appeal was mailed to the superior court on May 19. She filed a notice designating record on appeal on May 22. Corona received a letter on June 13, 2017 from the court clerk stating that the notice was rejected because there was "no indication that an appeal was ever filed in our office." She believed the superior court clerk lost her original notice of appeal, so she sent a new one to the clerk on June 23. Corona also filed another notice of designation of record. She had no idea "what happened to the original Notice of Appeal at the filing window," but "[i]t would appear that the Clerks, for reasons unknown . . . , simply wanted this case dismissed without good cause and did all in their power to accomplish that."

There is nothing in the record to show that Corona timely filed her notice of appeal. There is no proof of service of the notice of appeal, no signature card from the post office showing the superior court clerk's office received the notice of appeal but failed to file it, no sworn affidavit or declaration from whoever mailed the notice of appeal to the court (see, e.g., *Lezama-Carino v. Miller* (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 55, 58 [the appellant offered declaration from process server stating notice of appeal delivered to clerk for filing but clerk refused to accept it because waiting on waiver of costs]). All we have is Corona's statement that she timely filed her notice of appeal and the superior court clerk's office lost or deliberately misplaced it.

In *Estate of Crabtree* (1992) 4 Cal.App.4th 1119, the court noted the Evidence Code section 664 "presumption that 'official duty has been regularly performed' . . . applies to the duties of clerks of court. [Citations.] Thus we must presume, in the absence of affirmative evidence to the contrary, that the clerk performed his duty and endorsed the notice of appeal with the date it was in fact presented to him for filing." (*Id.* at p. 1125.) The attorney attempted to overcome this presumption with declarations from the attorney's secretary and a supervisor of the messenger service used as to the date the messenger picked up the notice of appeal for filing. (*Ibid.*) Conspicuously absent was a declaration by the messenger who, according to the appellant's counsel, had no recollection as to filing this particular notice of appeal. (*Id.* at p. 1126.) The court concluded: "given what we perceive as significant gaps in the evidentiary record presented by [the appellant], we do not believe she has overcome the presumption the notice of appeal was filed on January 3, 1991." (*Ibid.*)

Similarly here, Corona has not overcome the presumption that her notice of appeal was filed on June 30, 2017, the date it was stamped received and filed by the superior court clerk's office. Therefore, the notice of appeal was untimely and the appeal must be dismissed.<sup>1</sup>


---

<sup>1</sup> Corona's motion to augment the record is denied.

## DISPOSITION

The appeal is dismissed. Gasparyan is to recover her costs on appeal.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED




JOHNSON, J.

We concur:



ROTHSCHILD, P. J.



WEINGART, J.\*

---

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

**FILED**  
Superior Court of California  
County of Los Angeles

MAP 21 2013

MAR 21 2017

RECEIVED Shem R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk  
MAR 06 2017 M. Faune Deputy  
Maria C. Faune  
DEPT 33

DEPT. 33

卷之三十一

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL  
STANLEY MOSK COURTHOUSE - UNLIMITED**

CHARLES HODGES (DRIVER); VICKI CORONA (PASSENGER),  
Plaintiffs,  
vs.  
MARIYAM GASPARYAN,  
Defendants.

) CASE NO.: BC577738  
) Assigned for trial to:  
) Dept. 33, Hon. Charles F. Palmer  
[REDACTED] JUDGMENT  
Date Complaint Filed: April 6, 2015

This action came on for trial on February 21, 2017 in Department 33 of the Los Angeles Superior Court, Pasadena Courthouse, the Honorable Charles F. Palmer, judge, presiding. Plaintiff CHARLES HODGES had previously dismissed his case. Plaintiff VICKI CORONA appeared in pro per. Defendant MARIYAM GASPARYAN appeared by counsel, Sheryl Lee Reeves.

The case proceeded as a Court trial by stipulation of the parties.

After considering the testimony and evidence, as well as argument on behalf of Plaintiff VICKI CORONA and Defendant MARIYAM GASPARYAN, the Court found:

1. Plaintiff failed to meet her burden of proof; and
2. There was no evidence of causation of damages.

1 The Judgment is entered in favor of Defendant MARIYAM GASPARYAN and against  
2 Plaintiff VICKI CORONA. Prevailing party is entitled to recover her costs pursuant to the Code  
3 in the amount of \$ 4241.17.

4

5

6 Dated: March 21, 2017

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

  
The Honorable Charles F. Palmer,  
Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court

1                   **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2                   STATE OF CALIFORNIA                   )

3                   )                   **HODGES V. GASPARYAN**

4                   COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES                   )

5                   I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 330  
6                   North Brand Boulevard, Suite 850, Glendale, California 91203.

7                   On 3/6/17 I served the foregoing document described as  
8                   **[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT** on the interested parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof  
9                   enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

10                  Vicki Corona  
11                  4804 Laurel Canyon, #125  
12                  Studio City, CA 91607

13                  *Plaintiff in Pro Per*

14                   BY MAIL I deposited such envelope in the mail in Glendale, California. I am "readily  
15                  familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under  
16                  that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon  
17                  fully prepaid in Glendale, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion  
18                  of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is  
19                  more than one date after date of deposition for mailing in affidavit.

20                   BY EMAIL: The above-described transmission was transmitted by email to  
21                  DanceFantasyProductions@yahoo.com and not reported as incomplete by googlemail, the  
22                  undersigned's corporate mailserver.

23                   BY OVERNIGHT COURIER: I caused the above-referenced document(s) to be delivered  
24                  to an overnight courier service, via DHL, for delivery to the above address(es).

25                   BY PERSONAL SERVICE: I personally delivered copies of the foregoing document(s)  
26                  to the addressee(s) listed above.

27                  I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above  
28                  is true and correct. Executed on 3/6/17, at Glendale, California.

29                    
30                  Jennifer Dave

31                  7100-4740i

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