SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

COORDINATION PROCEEDING SPECIAL TITLE [RULE 3.550] ***California North Bay Fire Cases*** Included actions: *See appended list (Appendix B)*	Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No.: 4955 **ORDER GRANTING PETITIONS FOR COORDINATION AND STAYING CASES**

Procedural Background[1]

Beginning on October 8, 2017, several fires started in northern California. Some merged with each other and some did not. Over 50 lawsuits have been filed seeking to hold PG&E Corporation and/or Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) liable.

On October 31, 2017, the *Harvell* Plaintiffs[2] filed a petition seeking to coordinate all actions arising out of what have been termed the North Bay Fires in the Superior Court, San Francisco County. Other plaintiffs have joined in this. On November 9, 2017, PG&E filed a petition[3] seeking to coordinate the actions arising out of the North Bay Fires in five clusters, with

[1] A plain English summary of this order is appended at Appendix A.
[2] The *Harvell* Plaintiffs include 107 plaintiffs spread across seven actions, six of which were filed in San Francisco County Superior Court and one of which was filed in Sonoma County Superior Court. Harvell Memorandum in Support of Petition for Coordination, 2.
[3] At the time PG&E's petition was filed, there were fifteen subject actions, including the actions subject to the *Harvell* petition. PG&E's Petition for Coordination ¶¶ 6(a)-(o). Of those actions, ten were filed in San Francisco, four were filed in Sonoma, and one was filed in Napa. *Id.* PG&E has subsequently filed two add-on petitions. On December 5, 2017, PG&E requested that 32 additional actions be added. Of these, eighteen were filed in San

proceedings to be held in the county where, assertedly, most of the damage was caused by the several underlying fires. PG&E asks that some of the cases be assigned to counties that, at least as of now, have no pertinent cases.

Following a directive from the Chair of the Judicial Council, the Presiding Judge of this court assigned me as the coordination motion judge. On December 1, 2017, I assigned the eight additional included actions contained in PG&E's petition to this coordination motion.

On December 1, 2017, the *Koven* Plaintiffs[4] filed a petition for coordination of the actions arising out of the Tubbs Fire in a separate coordinated proceeding in Sonoma County.[5] On December 8, 2017, the *Hay* Plaintiffs[6] filed their petition for coordination of all actions arising out of the North Bay Fires in San Francisco.[7] On December 11, 2017, the *Butler* Plaintiffs[8] filed a petition in support of the *Harvell* Plaintiffs' petition by which the *Butler* Plaintiffs requested their actions be coordinated in one proceeding in San Francisco. In a December 13, 2017, the *Olds* Plaintiffs[9] endorsed coordinating all actions in San Francisco. That day the Atlas Fire Plaintiffs[10] filed papers arguing that Atlas Fire should be assigned to a distinct coordinated proceeding in Napa County. A few days later Plaintiff Taylor Waldon filed papers

---

Francisco, eleven were filed in Sonoma, and three were filed in Napa. PG&E Notice of Submission of Add-Ons, 2-4. On December 15, 2017, PG&E filed a second add-on petition with nine additional actions. Of those, six were filed in San Francisco and one in Sonoma. PG&E's Second Notice of Potential Add-On Cases, 2-8.

[4] The *Koven* Plaintiffs include five individuals who filed a single action. *See* Koven Petition, 1-2. The *Koven* petition encompasses 37 actions, including twenty filed in San Francisco, sixteen in Sonoma, and one filed in Napa. *Id.* at 2-7. At argument, the Koven plaintiffs on reflection modified their written recommendation to have all the cases coordinated in one locale—Santa Rosa, Sonoma County.

[5] There is no order that formally consolidates the *Koven* petition with the present petitions. However, the *Koven* petition relates to the same cases and substantially mirrors one aspect of PG&E's proposal.

[6] The *Hay* Plaintiffs include fourteen plaintiffs spread across seven actions, and the *Hay* petition included 55 actions. This included actions already subject to the petitions filed by the *Harvell* Plaintiffs and PG&E.

[7] There is no order that formally consolidates the *Hay* petition with the present petition. However, the *Hay* petition relates to the same cases and substantially mirrors the *Harvell* Plaintiffs' proposal.

[8] The *Butler* Plaintiffs include nine plaintiffs, each of whom filed separate actions. Eight of the actions were filed in San Francisco. The remaining action was filed in Sonoma.

[9] The *Olds* Plaintiffs include a class action and approximately seven plaintiffs spread across two actions, both of which were filed in San Francisco. At argument I heard that at least one more class action is likely to be filed.

[10] The Atlas Fire Plaintiffs include 21 individuals and a winery, each of whom suffered damage from the Atlas Fire, which occurred primarily in Napa County.

to have the Tubbs Fire cases coordinated as a separate proceeding in Sonoma, and Plaintiff Valerie Evans filed papers agreeing with PG&E's '5 cluster' argument. On December 20, 2017, the Subrogation Insurers[11] filed a brief in support or a single coordinated proceeding in San Francisco, as did the *Benham* Plaintiffs[12] on December 22, 2017.

On January 2, 2018 I heard argument on certain petitions for coordination.

Cases At Issue

After the Chair of the Judicial Council ordered the appointment of a coordination motion judge, a variety of filings revealed further cases subject to coordination. Some of those were potential add-on cases noticed December 5 and 15, 2017, others the subject of petitions or responses to petitions filed between December 12 and 29, 2017, and yet others just listed as potential add-ons. These are all listed as such in Appendix B to this order, in a listing created by PG&E at my request. My review of the papers and argument does not suggest that any of these cases should be treated differently from the original included actions, e.g., those designated by orders of the Chair of the Judicial Council dated November 13 and 27, 2017, and accordingly my order applies to each case listed in Appendix B below. CRC 3.531(b). If a party contends that it had insufficient notice of the coordination and is not properly an add-on case, it may file a motion before me not later than January 24, 2018, and thereafter should bring its concerns to the attention of the coordination trial judge assuming one is appointed.

Discussion

Coordination is governed by C.C.P. §§ 404 and C.C.P. § 404.1 *et seq.* See also CRC 3.520 *et seq.* See generally *Ford Motor Warranty Cases*, 11 Cal.App.5th 626, 629 (2017). All

[11] The Subrogation Insurers had filed a total of three complaints as of the date of their brief.
[12] The *Benham* Plaintiffs include 78 plaintiffs spread over six actions.

parties correctly agree (i) the actions are complex, and (ii) coordination is appropriate. The only issue is whether there should one or more coordinated proceedings. CRC 3.530.

A. *Predominance of common questions of law or fact.* Parties favoring a single proceeding argue that the cases will focus on PG&E's high level policies and its preparedness for weather events such as the high winds present in the region when the fires started on October 8, 2017 or shortly after.[13] Parties favoring separate proceedings argue that the cases depend on the precise mechanism causing a given fire.[14]

(1) *Common issues.* These include PG&E's policies and practices, including those regarding (a) the electrification of lines during high wind conditions, (b) the sorts of maintenance required of vegetation and of lines and poles; (c) training practices that apply to the multiple PG&E inspectors responsible for various types of maintenance. All the fires started in the same region under the same or similar (high wind) weather conditions. There is likely to be a substantial overlap as among the PG&E witnesses and documents, as well as the experts, as among all the cases.

(2) *Individual issues.* There are fire-specific variations in the facts to be adduced, such as the mechanism that caused each fire, and the conduct of third parties that may have contributed to each fire. It is possible that a given set of general policies may be found reasonable with respect to one fire and negligent with respect to another, given the differing circumstances, also suggesting individual issues. We do not now know if fire-specific discovery will track PG&E's 5 fire proposal, or some other pattern, because it may be that what we now term one fire will have multiple ignition sources presenting multiple factual inquires; indeed PG&E recommends

[13] Harvell Memorandum, 7-8; Joinder, 5; Hay Memorandum, 5-7; Olds Response, 5-6, 8; Subrogation Plaintiffs Memorandum, 3-5, 8-10; Harvell Opposition, 3.
[14] PG&E Memorandum, 9-10, 14-15; Koven Memorandum, 8; Schulz Declaration in Support of Koven Memorandum ¶¶ 19-21; Atlas Fire Plaintiffs Response, 6-8.

that at least one of its 5 proceedings *include multiple fires*. So we do not know if adopting PG&E's five part division will or will not help keep these detailed factual inquires distinct, or to what extent.[15] Nor do we know, at this stage, if a fire such as the Atlas Fire had one or more ignition sources.

There are of course a series of other individual issues, no matter how we slice up the cases: each plaintiff has unique damages, for example. Such factors do not favor one, three, or five coordinated proceedings.

(3) *Predominance of common factors.* We can predict common discovery and motion practice across all of the fires relating to PG&E's policies and practices, and common legal issues relating to inverse condemnation and other matters. So there are benefits that can only be achieved through a single coordinated proceeding. A single judge can oversee a single discovery plan applicable to all of the fires, including depositions, admissions, and documents, and ensure for example relevant items are deemed produced as to all pertinent cases. The single judge can create multiple tracks—perhaps 5, if PG&E is right—to accommodate the track-specific discovery that needs to be done, involving only the parties and counsel interested in those facts.

The present matters are reminiscent of the *Ford Motor Warranty Cases*. There, the "Lemon Law" cases involved a common transmission system installed in two different models of cars over several model years by a single manufacturer. *Ford Motor Warranty Cases*, 11 Cal.App.5th 626, 629 (2017). There were common discovery issues regarding e.g., the design and modification of the transmission at issue, in addition to individualized facts that required review at trial. 11 Cal.App.5th at 641-43. Here, each of the fires shares, at least at the pleading stage, a common core allegation: PG&E's alleged lax maintenance and failure to prepare for a

[15] Nor by the same token do we know if, following other parties' suggestions, we sliced off the Atlas or the Tubbs fire, we would nevertheless have multiple ignition sources for each of those fires.

foreseeable weather event. As in the *Ford Motor Warranty Cases*, the fact that some individual issues must be resolved in each case, or separately as to specific fires, does not undercut the benefits of coordination.

Coordinating the claims into distinct proceedings based on the fire at issue will likely cause unnecessary procedural delays. Complaints may allege damages resulting from multiple fires in multiple counties or may simply be vague as to which fire caused damage.[16] Sorting each complaint, including ruling on anticipated motions to sever, into separate coordinated proceedings would result in unnecessary delay throughout the proceedings.

A final word on the delays feared by plaintiffs, such as those urging me to segregate the Atlas Fire cases for Napa county. This is a serious concern. Coordination can be clumsy, and there is always a risk that delays in one part of a coordinated litigation ramify across the cases. But the powers of the coordination trial judge are substantial, and include the ability to expedite a case or group of cases. *McGhan Med. Corp. v. Superior Court*, 11 Cal. App. 4th 804, 812 (1992).

Even were the Atlas Fire cases sent, for example, to Napa, it is likely that the Napa judge would then be required to coordinate common discovery (such as that against PG&E) with the other judges handling the other cases, indeed to the extent of avoiding, if possible, conflicting orders on discoverability, burden, proper topics for PMK depositions, and so on. All of which is to say that while the efficiency of one case may not be efficient for all, factors which may delay coordinated cases cannot be avoiding by peeling off one set of cases to e.g., Napa County.

B. *Convenience of Parties, Witnesses, and Counsel.* The distances between the various counties involved is not so severe as to suggest this is a significant factor. San Francisco

[16] *See* Pitre Declaration in Support of Hay Petition, Ex. A at ¶¶ 1, 7, Ex. B at ¶¶ 1, 7, Ex. C at ¶¶ 1-2, 10-14; Ex. D at ¶¶ 1, 7; Ex. E at ¶¶ 1-2.

with its nearby international airport is somewhat more convenient than the counties to the north, but all are within reasonable driving distance, and the availability of Court Call further reduces the inconvenience for parties and lawyers residing in the North Bay. San Francisco is surely the most convenient location for PG&E, and plaintiffs' counsel representing the vast bulk of current plaintiffs also favor San Francisco, including for its convenience. The e-filing procedures in San Francisco, and the widespread availability of all e-filed documents, favors San Francisco above the rest of the nominated counties.

C. *Relative Development of the Actions and the Work Product of Counsel.* The cases have all just been filed. This factor weighs in favor of coordination generally, but has no weight in determining whether to include all of the subject actions in a single coordinated proceeding or in several separate coordinated proceedings.

D. *Efficient Utilization of Judicial Facilities and Manpower and the Calendar of the Courts.* A single coordinated proceeding will ensure one judge is apprised of the status of the litigation as a whole. Other courts may well become involved, because even with proceedings coordinated in San Francisco, the coordination judge "is vested with 'whatever great breadth of discretion may be necessary and appropriate to ease the transition through the judicial system of the logjam of cases which gives rise to coordination.'" *Ford Motor Warranty Cases*, 11 Cal.App.5th at 645. So trials need not be held in one place. *Id.* at 644.[17] And a single forum avoids the specter of e.g., five judges coordinating not only all the cases before each of them but also with the other judges.

[17] Even where the coordinated cases may not be tried in one forum, "coordination will enable the parties to consider stipulations of facts that need not be proven and other procedures to expedite the presentation of evidence, to obtain rulings on motions in limine, and to develop jury questionnaires, jury instructions, special verdicts, and interrogatories that may be used in future trials." *Ford Motor Warranty Cases*, 11 Cal.App.5th at 644.

E. *Disadvantages of Duplicative and Inconsistent Rulings, Orders, or Judgments.* This factor favors a single proceeding. There is a risk that inconsistent rulings and orders pertaining to general issues will result from splitting these actions into separate proceedings. Also, the five proceedings recommended by PG&E could implicate two separate appellate districts (although this could be avoided by my designation of a single appellate court).

F. *Likelihood of Settlement Without Further Litigation Should Coordination be Denied.* This factor suggests coordination, but not whether there should be one or more proceedings. As the facts develop, the parties may seek one settlement or settlement of some portion of the cases. This is true regardless of whether the cases are in one or (for example) five locations.

Proper Superior Court For Coordination Proceedings

San Francisco County is best equipped to handle a single coordinated proceeding. With one exception,[18] no party has proposed a single coordinated proceeding in another venue. This venue is most appropriate because: (1) Most of the cases at issue were filed in San Francisco County; (2) San Francisco County supports e-filing, whereas the other counties in which cases have been filed do not, or at least not to the same extent; (3) San Francisco County has a designated complex litigation department, whereas the other counties in which cases have been filed do not; and (4) San Francisco County is the most accessible option to individuals traveling from Southern California and out-of-state, and is not far removed from the North Bay counties.

Proper Court to Exercise Appellate Jurisdiction Over Coordination Proceedings

The First District Court of Appeal is most appropriate. San Francisco County is included within the First District. The only other counties where cases have been filed, Sonoma and Napa, are also within the First District.

[18] See above note 4.

Stay

PG&E requests a stay pending coordination. PG&E Memorandum, 18-19. C.C.P. § 404.5. Plaintiff Valerie Evans opposes the request, arguing that she has served narrow time-sensitive discovery. Evans Response, 1-2. At argument I stated my tentative view that a stay was appropriate, and no party argued to the contrary.

The request is granted. A limited (and not general) stay is imposed: discovery, motion practice, and the obligations to respond to complaints and cross complaints are stayed pending further order of the coordination trial judge.

Conclusion

The petitions to coordinate are granted to the extent they seek coordination of the cases in a single county, and are otherwise denied.

I recommend the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco, be the site for the coordinated proceedings and I designate the Court of Appeal, First District, as the reviewing court.

The included cases are subject to the limited stay as described above.

Petitioner PG&E is directed to serve a copy of this order on (1) all parties to the included coordinated actions, and (2) the clerk of each court for filing in each included action, and otherwise as required. CRC 3.529.

DATED: January 4, 2018

Curtis E.A. Karnow
Judge Of The Superior Court
Coordination Motion Judge

Appendix A

Plain English Summary[19]

As a result of the so-called "North Bay Fires" many hundreds of lawsuits have been filed against PG&E, which is accused of being legally responsible for the damage caused by those fires. Many more cases will probably be filed. Most of the cases were filed in San Francisco, because that's where PG&E has its offices. But other people brought cases in other counties such as Napa and Sonoma.

Under California law, people involved in related cases can ask a court to assign all the cases to one judge. This is termed coordination. Coordinated cases usually go through pretrial procedures together, but they may or may not go to trial together. Even if cases are coordinated in one county, individual cases could go to trial in other counties, such as the county where they were originally filed.

Some of the people who brought these cases want them handled closer to where they live, such as Napa, Sonoma, and other counties. PG&E thinks it's best to divide up all the cases and send them out to 5 different counties, centered on where the various fires started. Others involved in these cases want all the cases coordinated in one county, San Francisco.

This order recommends that the pretrial procedures for all the cases be in San Francisco, because that's the most convenient place for almost everyone, and because there are a series of fact and legal issues which are common to all the cases, which can therefore be handled once, as opposed to many—possibly conflicting—ways across the various counties.

After this order is filed, the Chair of the Judicial Council, who is the Chief Justice of California, will decide whether to accept or reject the recommendation on coordination.

[19] This is for the convenience of the lay reader and is not the court's analysis or decision.

Appendix B

Included Actions per November 13, 2017 Order by the Chair of the Judicial Council

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17- 561937	Harvell et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17- 562172	Berry et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562175	Daniels et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562173	Green et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562192	Krause et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-561997	O'Neal et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261436	Heidingsfelder et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.

Additional Included Actions per November 27, 2017 Order by the Chair of the Judicial Council

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of Napa	17CV001224	Evans v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-561983	Schrock v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562246	Tandrup et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562251	Ruiz et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562320	Omlin et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261490	Hill v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261484	Thomas et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261489	Burton v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.

Actions included in PG&E Defendants' Notices of Potential Add-On Cases dated December 5 and December 15 2017

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562380	Hollinger et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261513	Hollenbeck et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562456	Hay et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562457	Jordan et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562458	Wilson et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562460	Silvas et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Napa	17CV001284	Animo L.P. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Napa	17CV001292	Amador et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261534	Meyer et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261535	Wilson et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261536	Callagy et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261542	Davenport et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562536	Chaddha et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Napa	17CV001293	Langner et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562366	Winkle v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562537	Beugelmans et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562647	Butler v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562648	Perliss Estate Vineyards LLC v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562660	Belon et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562661	Bowman et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562664	Olson v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562665	Tran v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562666	Udell v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562667	Wood v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562668	Bubel v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562729	Godfrey v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261556	Koven et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261558	Clausen et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261564	Carucci et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261581	Turner v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261587	Reynoso et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261591	Waldon v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562753	Preimesberger et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562755	Reynoso et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562791	Olds et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562809	Robertson et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562815	Goldberg v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261599	Andrews et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261602	Appleton et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261618	Bevier et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562953	Simmons et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.

Additional Actions Identified in Coordination Petitions or Responses Filed between December 12, 2017 and December 29, 2017

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of Napa	17CV001397	Hagafen Cellars Inc. et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Napa	17CV001398	Ashworth et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562990	Bostan v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563006	Rasouli et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563008	Amaya et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563183	United Services Automobile Association et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563184	State Farm General Insurance Company et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563185	California Fair Plan Association et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563286	Alves et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563288	Hancock et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563290	Andrew et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563292	Pardini et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563293	Benham et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563295	Glabicki et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.

Additional Potential Add-On Actions

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563134	Holstine v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563135	Burwell v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563136	Atlas Peak Mountain Winery LLC v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563137	Donzelli v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563138	Jepsen v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261692	Bricker et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563273	Merjil et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563276	Hancock et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563279	Pardini et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563315	Gilbert v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563316	Kinney v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563317	Cisneros v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563318	Giannini v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563320	Bellenger v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563322	Malone et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563327	Adkins et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563328	Friedland v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563329	Perez v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563330	Hogan v. PG&E Corporation et al.

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261723	Ger Hospitality LLC v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Napa	17CV001454	Patland et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563387	Anderson v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563363	McNeive et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563389	Wasem et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261698	Poundstone et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261701	Gaytan et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563407	Ortiz et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.

Superior Court of California
County of San Francisco

COORDINATION PROCEEDING SPECIAL TITLE [RULE 3.550] **CALIFORNIA NORTH BAY FIRE CASES** Included actions see attached list:	JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION PROCEEDING NO. 4955 **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING** (CCP 1013a (4))

I, Danial Lemire, a Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court of the City and County of San Francisco, certify that I am not a party to the within action.

On January 4, 2018, I served the attached **ORDER GRANTING PETITION FOR COORDINATION AND STAYING CASES,** by placing copies thereof in sealed envelopes, addressed as follows:

Chair, Judicial Council of California Attn: Appellate Court Services (Civil Case Coordination) 455 Golden Gate Avenue, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94102-3688	Bill Robins III Robert T. Bryson Kevin M. Pollack ROBINS CLOUD LLP 808 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 450 Santa Monica, CA 90401
Scott Summy John P. Fiske BARON & BUDD, P.C. 603 N. Coast Highway, Suite G Solana Beach, CA 92075	Gerald Singleton Erika L. Vasquez Amanda LoCurto SINGLETON LAW FIRM, APC 115 West Plaza Street Solana Beach, CA 92075
Ahmed S. Diab Deborah S. Dixon Robert J. Chambers DIXON DIAB & CHAMBERS LLP 501 W. Broadway, Suite 800 San Diego, CA 92101	Donald S. Edgar EDGAR LAW FIRM 408 College Avenue Santa Rosa, CA 95401
Keith E. Eggleton WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI Professional Corporation 650 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, CA 94304	Evan R. Chesler Kevin J. Orsini CRAVATI, SWAINE & MOORE LLP 825 Eighth Avenue New York, NY 10019
John P. Flynn WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION One Market Plaza Spear Tower, Suite 3300 San Francisco, CA 94105	

I then placed the sealed envelopes in the outgoing mail at 400 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA. 94102 on the date indicated above for collection, attachment of required prepaid postage, and mailing on that date following standard court practices.

Dated: January 4, 2018

MICHAEL YUEN, Clerk

By: _____

Danial Lemire, Deputy Court Clerk

COORDINATION PROCEEDING SPECIAL TITLE [RULE 3.550]

CALIFORNIA NORTH BAY FIRE CASES
(JCCP 4955)

Coordinated Cases

Included Actions per November 13, 2017 Order by the Chair of the Judicial Council

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17- 561937	Harvell et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17- 562172	Berry et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562175	Daniels et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562173	Green et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562192	Krause et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-561997	O'Neal et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261436	Heidingsfelder et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.

Additional Included Actions per November 27, 2017 Order by the Chair of the Judicial Council

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of Napa	17CV001224	Evans v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-561983	Schrock v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562246	Tandrup et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562251	Ruiz et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562320	Omlin et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261490	Hill v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261484	Thomas et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261489	Burton v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.

Actions included in PG&E Defendants' Notices of Potential Add-On Cases dated December 5 and December 15 2017

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562380	Hollinger et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261513	Hollenbeck et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562456	Hay et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562457	Jordan et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562458	Wilson et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562460	Silvas et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Napa	17CV001284	Animo L.P. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Napa	17CV001292	Amador et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261534	Meyer et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261535	Wilson et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261536	Callagy et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261542	Davenport et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562536	Chaddha et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Napa	17CV001293	Langner et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562366	Winkle v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562537	Beugelmans et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562647	Butler v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562648	Perliss Estate Vineyards LLC v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562660	Belon et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562661	Bowman et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562664	Olson v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562665	Tran v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562666	Udell v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562667	Wood v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562668	Bubel v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562729	Godfrey v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261556	Koven et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261558	Clausen et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261564	Carucci et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261581	Turner v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261587	Reynoso et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261591	Waldon v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562753	Preimesberger et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562755	Reynoso et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562791	Olds et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562809	Robertson et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562815	Goldberg v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261599	Andrews et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261602	Appleton et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261618	Bevier et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562953	Simmons et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.

Additional Actions Identified in Coordination Petitions or Responses Filed between December 12, 2017 and December 29, 2017

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of Napa	17CV001397	Hagafen Cellars Inc. et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Napa	17CV001398	Ashworth et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562990	Bostan v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563006	Rasouli et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563008	Amaya et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563183	United Services Automobile Association et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563184	State Farm General Insurance Company et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563185	California Fair Plan Association et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563286	Alves et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563288	Hancock et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563290	Andrew et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563292	Pardini et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563293	Benham et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563295	Glabicki et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.

Additional Potential Add-On Actions

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563134	Holstine v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563135	Burwell v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563136	Atlas Peak Mountain Winery LLC v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563137	Donzelli v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563138	Jepsen v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261692	Bricker et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563273	Merjil et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563276	Hancock et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563279	Pardini et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563315	Gilbert v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563316	Kinney v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563317	Cisneros v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563318	Giannini v. PG&E Corporation et al.

COURT	NUMBER	SHORT TITLE
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563320	Bellenger v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563322	Malone et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563327	Adkins et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563328	Friedland v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563329	Perez v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563330	Hogan v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261723	Ger Hospitality LLC v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Napa	17CV001454	Patland et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563387	Anderson v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563363	McNeive et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563389	Wasem et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261698	Poundstone et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of Sonoma	SCV-261701	Gaytan et al. v. PG&E Corporation et al.
Superior Court of California County of San Francisco	CGC-17-563407	Ortiz et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al.