

CALIFORNIA  
ACADEMY OF  
APPELLATE  
LAWYERS

**President**

**Joseph P. Mascovich**  
Schroeder Schaff & Low, Inc.  
2205 Plaza Dr., Suite 225  
Rocklin, CA 95765-4445

**Vice President**

**Sean M. SeLegue**  
Arnold & Porter  
Three Embarcadero Ctr., 10<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4024

**Treasurer**

**Benjamin G. Shatz**  
Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP  
2049 Century Park East, Suite 1700  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3119

**Secretary**

**Judith E. Posner**  
Benedon & Serlin, LLP  
22708 Mariano St.  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367-6028

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Susan Brandt-Hawley  
Raymond A. Cardozo  
Michael G. Colantuono  
Jon B. Eisenberg  
Margaret A. Grignon  
Laurie J. Hepler  
Kirk C. Jenkins  
Wendy C. Lascher  
James C. Martin  
Joseph P. Mascovich  
Steven L. Mayer  
Robin Meadow  
Judith E. Posner  
Sean M. SeLegue  
Benjamin G. Shatz  
John A. Taylor, Jr.

**WWW.CALAPPELLATE.ORG**

**VIA TRUEFILING**

September 5, 2024

Supreme Court of California  
350 McAllister Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: *TRC Operating Company, Inc., et al. v. Chevron U.S.A. Inc.*,  
Case No. S286233

Honorable Justices:

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.500(g), the California Academy of Appellate Lawyers submits this letter in support of review. As set forth below, this case presents an opportunity to resolve a split among the Courts of Appeal on a regularly encountered question of appellate procedure.

**1. INTEREST OF THE ACADEMY**

The Academy's members are more than 140 experienced appellate practitioners whose common goals include promoting and encouraging sound appellate procedures that ensure proper and effective representation of appellate litigants, efficient administration of justice at the appellate level, and improvements in the law affecting appellate litigation.

**2. REASONS FOR GRANTING REVIEW**

The Academy supports a grant of review on the second issue presented in the Petition for Review. The Academy takes no position on the correct resolution of that question nor on the first and third issues.

The Court of Appeal identified a split in authority regarding whether an appellate court has jurisdiction, when reviewing a new trial order, to remand for further proceedings. (Opinion 35-36.) The parties appear to be in agreement that such a conflict exists. The Academy believes this is an issue that will recur on a regular basis and that there is no need for further

percolation of the issue. It is a discrete legal question that this Court can readily resolve, obviating the need for the Courts of Appeal and parties to debate the issue repeatedly.

Respectfully Submitted,



Sean M. SeLegue (155249)  
for:

CALIFORNIA ACADEMY OF APPELLATE  
LAWYERS AMICUS CURIAE COMMITTEE

Sean M. SeLegue, Chair (155249)  
Robert S. Gerstein (35941)  
Margaret M. Grignon (230355)  
Rex S. Heinke (66163)  
Richard A. Rothschild (67356)  
Alana H. Rotter (236666)  
Jonathan B. Steiner (48734)<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Two members of the Committee did not participate in consideration of this matter.