

SUPREME COURT
FILED

Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four - No. B354290 JUN 24 2026

Jorge Navarrete Cler

S296715

Deputy

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

En Banc

MEGAN HARWOOD, Petitioner,

v.

SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, Respondent;

JUSTIN GURNARI, Real Party in Interest.

The petition for review is denied.

GUERRERO

Chief Justice



Appellate Courts Case Information

Supreme Court

Change court



Case Summary
Docket
Briefs
Disposition
Parties and Attorneys
Lower Court

Disposition

HARWOOD v. S.C. (GURNARI)

Division SF

Case Number [S296715](#)

Only the following dispositions are displayed below: Orders Denying Petitions, Orders Granting Rehearing and Opinions. Go to the Docket Entries screen for information regarding orders granting review.

Case Citation: none

Date	Description
06/24/2026	Petition for review denied

[Click here to request automatic e-mail notifications about this case.](#)



[Careers](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Accessibility](#) | [Public Access to Records](#) |
[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy](#)

© 2026 Judicial
 Council of
 California

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FOUR

COURT OF APPEAL - SECOND DIST.

FILED

May 06, 2026

EVA McCLINTOCK, Clerk

W. Lopez

Deputy Clerk

MEGAN HARWOOD,

Petitioner,

v.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,

Respondent;

JUSTIN GURNARI,

Real Party in Interest.

B354290

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. 22STFL01211)
(Jeffrey Korn III, Temporary
Judge (Pursuant to Cal. Const.,
art. VI, § 21))


ORDER

THE COURT:*

The petition for writ of mandate or prohibition filed on May 1, 2026, and refiled May 4, 2026, has been read and considered, along with the motion to deem the petition filed on April 30, 2026. The motion is granted. The petition is denied for failure to establish entitlement to extraordinary relief.



* ZUKIN, P.J.



COLLINS, J.



MORI, J.

Name: Gunari v. HarwoodCase Number (if you know it):
22 STFL 01211

----- Court fills out below -----



(Optional)

Important! If your case is delayed or dismissed after you make this request and you do not need the accommodation for the date you specified under 3, please contact the court at:

Phone: _____

Email: _____

☐ Your request is **GRANTED**. The court will provide the accommodation(s) requested.☒ Your request is **DENIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART**. The denied portion of your request:☐ Does not meet the requirements of Cal. Rules of Court, rule 1.100.☒ Creates an undue financial or administrative burden for the court.☐ Changes the basic nature of the court's service, program, or activity.

Explain the reasons supporting the box(es) checked above:

Case has been continued multiple times depriving other party
finality in Dissolution case and creating burden on Court's calendar.
Post-hearing submissions would be ex parte and are not permitted


☒ **Instead**, the court will provide the following accommodation(s):

Support person permitted, remote appearance, CART, breaks
during proceeding permitted.

The court will provide the accommodation(s):

☐ For the date(s) and time(s) requested ☒ Indefinitely☐ On date(s): _____☐ More information on this decision is attached.Date: 4/18/2026
JEFFREY W. KORNJEFFREY W. KORN

Type or print name

Signature 

JEFFREY W. KORN

The court responded in person, by phone, or mail/email on: _____

Note: You may be able to ask for a review of this decision.Cal. Rules of Court, rule 1.100(g) explains how to do this.



Megan B. Harwood <megan.harwood@gmail.com>

CART and order for 22STFL01211

ADACoordinator <ADACoordinator@lacourt.org>
To: "Megan B. Harwood" <megan.harwood@gmail.com>

Mon, Apr 20, 2026 at 9:52 AM

Hello—

I was just given the order on your request for accommodation. For trial in 22STFL01211, CART will be displayed on a site called Streamtext. The link is <https://www.streamtext.net/player?event=LACOURTMH> and will be used for the whole trial.

If you disagree with the order, please see CRC 1.100(g) for review procedures.

George Ellis | ADA Coordinator

Legal Services Division

Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

111 N. Hill Street | Suite 546

Los Angeles, CA 90012

O: 213-633-5882

ADACoordinator@lacourt.org | www.lacourt.ca.gov

Harwood - 22STFL01211 - Order - 2026-04-18.pdf
250K



Appellate Courts Case Information

Supreme Court

Change court



Case Summary
Docket
Briefs
Disposition
Parties and Attorneys
Lower Court

Docket (Register of Actions)

HARWOOD v. S.C. (GURNARI)

Division SF

Case Number S296715

Date	Description	Notes
05/18/2026	Petition for review filed	Petitioner: Megan Harwood Pro Per
05/18/2026	Record requested	
05/18/2026	Received Court of Appeal record	
05/18/2026	Forma pauperis application filed	Megan Harwood, Petitioner Pro Per
05/19/2026	Forma Pauperis application granted	Megan Harwood, Petitioner Pro Per



Date	Description	Notes
06/24/2026	Petition for review denied	

[Click here to request automatic e-mail notifications about this case.](#)

[Careers](#) |
 [Contact Us](#) |
 [Accessibility](#) |
 [Public Access to Records](#) |
 [Terms of Use](#) |
 [Privacy](#)

© 2026 Judicial
 Council of
 California

APPENDIX E — RELEVANT LEGAL PROVISIONS

The following constitutional, statutory, and rule provisions are reproduced because they are directly implicated by the question presented. Rule 1.100 is excerpted; only subdivisions (e) and (g) are reproduced.

U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

42 U.S.C. § 12132 — Discrimination

Subject to the provisions of this subchapter, no qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any such entity.

28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) — State courts; certiorari

Final judgments or decrees rendered by the highest court of a State in which a decision could be had, may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari where the validity of a treaty or statute of the United States is drawn in question or where the validity of a statute of any State is drawn in question on the ground of its being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States, or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is specially set up or claimed under the Constitution or the treaties or statutes of, or any commission held or authority exercised under, the United States.

California Rules of Court, rule 1.100(e)

Response to accommodation request

The court must respond to a request for accommodation as follows:

(1) In determining whether to grant an accommodation request or provide an appropriate alternative accommodation, the court must consider, but is not limited by, California Civil Code section 51 et seq., the provisions of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.), and other applicable state and federal laws.

(2) The court must promptly inform the applicant of the determination to grant or deny an accommodation request. If the accommodation request is denied in whole or in part, the response must be in writing. On request of the applicant, the court may also provide an additional response in an alternative format. The response to the applicant must indicate:

(A) Whether the request for accommodation is granted or denied, in whole or in part, or an alternative accommodation is granted;

(B) If the request for accommodation is denied, in whole or in part, the reason therefor;

(C) The nature of any accommodation to be provided;

(D) The duration of any accommodation to be provided; and

(E) If the response is in writing, the date the response was delivered in person or sent to the applicant.

California Rules of Court, rule 1.100(g)

Review procedure

(1) If the determination to grant or deny a request for accommodation is made by nonjudicial court personnel, an applicant or any participant in the proceeding may submit a written request for review of that determination to the presiding judge or designated judicial officer. The request for review must be submitted within 10 days of the date the response under (e)(2) was delivered in person or sent.

(2) If the determination to grant or deny a request for accommodation is made by a presiding judge or another judicial officer, an applicant or any participant in the proceeding may file a petition for a writ of mandate under rules 8.485–8.493 or 8.930–8.936 in the appropriate reviewing court. The petition must be filed within 10 days of the date the response under (e)(2) was delivered in person or sent to the petitioner. For purposes of this rule, only those participants in the proceeding who were notified by the court of the determination to grant or deny the request for accommodation are considered real parties in interest in a writ proceeding. The petition for the writ must be served on the respondent court and any real party in interest as defined in this rule.

(3) The confidentiality of all information of the applicant concerning the request for accommodation and review under (g)(1) or (2) must be maintained as required under (c)(4).