

SUPREME COURT
FILED

MAY 22 2019

Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One - No. B283658

Jorge Navarrete Clerk

S255259

Deputy

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

En Banc

VICKI CORONA, Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

MARIYAM 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NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

COURT OF APPEAL - SECOND DIST.

DIVISION SEVEN

FILED

Feb 21, 2019

DANIEL P. POTTER, Clerk

VICKI CORONA,

B283658

jzelaya

Deputy Clerk

Plaintiff and Appellant,

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

v.

MARIYAM GASPARYAN,

Defendant and Respondent.

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.¹

¹ 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.

33

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
05/22/2017

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

MAR 21 2017

RECEIVED
MAR 06 2017
DEPT. 33
Shari R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk
Maria C. Fauna, Deputy

**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

[PROPOSED] 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. *g*

4
5
6 Dated: March 21, 2017

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

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
2
[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT

000047

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 X 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 X 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
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Jennifer Dave

7100-4740i

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