

CASE #: S243029

**IN THE SUPREME COURT  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

ALAN HEIMLICH,  
Petitioner

v.

SHIRAZ M. SHIVJI,  
Respondent

Case No.

**Sixth Appellate District, Case No. H042641**

**Santa Clara County Superior Ct. Case No. 112CV231939**

**PETITION FOR REVIEW  
OF DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEAL  
SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

**STAY REQUESTED** of APPELLATE RULING TO SUPERIOR  
COURT issued May 31, 2017.

Law Offices of Nicholas D. Heimlich  
Nicholas D. Heimlich (SBN 233232)  
5595 Winfield Blvd., Suite 110  
San Jose, California 95123  
Phone (408) 457-9364, Fax (408) 841-7630.  
Email [nickheimlich@nickheimlichlaw.com](mailto:nickheimlich@nickheimlichlaw.com)

**ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER ALAN HEIMLICH**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

COVER PAGE ..... 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... 2

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... 3

I. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW ..... 4

II. REASONS FOR GRANTING REVIEW ..... 5

    A. Review should be granted because the Sixth District’s Opinion ignores the California Supreme Court’s prior holding in *White v. Western Title Ins. Co.* (1985) 40 Cal.3d 870 (*White*) regarding the admissibility of CCP 998 offers to compromise which interpreted 998(b)(2) ..... 5

    B. Review should be granted to resolve a conflict among Court of Appeal decisions regarding when a “timely” request for CCP 998 costs must be made. .... 6

    C. Review should be granted to provide guidance as to whether a Court is permitted to create a new mandate for a post-final Arbitration Award. .... 7

III. STATEMENT OF THE CASE ..... 10

    A. The Civil Case ..... 10

    B. The Arbitration ..... 10

    C. Confirmation of the Arbitration Award ..... 11

    D. Motion to Tax Costs ..... 11

    E. Appeal to Sixth District Court of Appeals ..... 12

    F. Request for Rehearing ..... 12

IV. ARGUMENT ..... 12

V. CONCLUSION..... 14

CERTIFICATION OF WORD COUNT ..... 15

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE..... 16

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### **California Supreme Court**

<i>Moncharsh v. Heily &amp; Blase</i> , (1992) 3 Cal.4th .....	8
<i>Moshonov v. Walsh</i> (2000) 22 Cal.4th 771 .....	8
<i>White v. Western Title Ins. Co.</i> (1985) 40 Cal.3d 870.....	4, 5

### **Cases**

<i>California Faculty Assn. v. Superior Court</i> (1998) 63 Cal.App.4th 935 .....	7
<i>City of Palo Alto v. Service Employees Internat. Union</i> (1999) 77 Cal.App.4th 327 .....	8
<i>Lee v. Fidelity National Title Ins. Co.</i> (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 583 .....	12
<i>Maaso v. Signer</i> (2012) 203 Cal.App.4th 362.....	6, 10, 13

### **Codes**

CCP 998.....	passim
--------------	--------

### **Rules**

AAA Rule R-47 .....	8, 9
AAA Rule R-50 .....	8
California Court Rule 8.268(a).....	12

### **Other Authorities**

Cal. Practice Guide: Alternative Dispute Resolution (The Rutter Group 2015) .....	6
--	---

## **PETITION FOR REVIEW**

To the Honorable Chief Justice of the California Supreme Court and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of California:

Alan Heimlich, Petitioner, respectfully petitions for review of the decision of the Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District (per Conrad L. Rushing, P.J.), issued on May 31, 2017. Petition for rehearing (June 15, 2017) and Sur petition for rehearing (June 22, 2017) denied on June 27, 2017.

Petitioner requests a STAY of the Appellate ruling issued May 31, 2017 which directs the Superior Court to take action. The rationale for the stay is to avoid a possible conflicting ruling that may need to be undone later and to avoid wasting court resources.

### **I. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW**

This case presents the following issues for review:

- 1.. Determine if the Sixth District has invalidated the California Supreme Court's ruling in *White v. Western Title Ins. Co.* (1985) 40 Cal.3d 870 (*White*).
2. Determine whether the Sixth District erred in holding that CCP 998 offers are not allowed prior to a final Arbitration award for the purpose of preserving the right to post-offer costs.
3. Resolve the split in the Courts of Appeal created by the Sixth District's opinion, regarding when a "timely" request for CCP 998 costs must be made.
4. Determine whether the Sixth District erred in creating a new mandate for a post-final Arbitration order.

## II. REASONS FOR GRANTING REVIEW

### **A. REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED BECAUSE THE SIXTH DISTRICT'S OPINION IGNORES THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT'S PRIOR HOLDING IN *WHITE V. WESTERN TITLE INS. CO.* (1985) 40 CAL.3D 870 (*WHITE*) REGARDING THE ADMISSIBILITY OF CCP 998 OFFERS TO COMPROMISE WHICH INTERPRETED 998(B)(2)**

In briefing and oral argument, Mr. Heimlich listed several ways in which Mr. Shivji could have reserved the right to have the Arbitrator rule on a CCP 998 motion, including after the close of evidence but before the final order. The Opinion found each of these improper, holding that “we do not believe that such a pre-award request or alert would be consistent with the evidentiary restriction in section 998, subdivision (b)(2).” In doing so, the Opinion erroneously conflated presenting details of a CCP 998 offer with the mere explanation that a CCP 998 offer existed, in direct conflict with *White*.

The *White* court stated “that [the 998(b)(2)] language refers to the trial upon the liability which the offer proposed to compromise” and held that section 998, subdivision (b)(2) “bar[s] the introduction into evidence of an offer to compromise a claim for the purpose of proving liability for that claim,” but “permit[s] its introduction to prove some other matter at issue.” (Emphasis added.) (*White, supra*, at pp. 888-889.) Accordingly, in this case [*White*], section 998, subdivision (b)(2) barred the introduction of the 998 offer to prove Defendants’ liability for malpractice, but permitted its introduction on the issue of costs.

In *White*, the court approved a procedure whereby the trial court bifurcated the trial and admitted the 998 offer into evidence in the second phase of the trial, which did not involve the liability that the 998 offer proposed to compromise. (*Id.* at p. 889.)

The Appellate Court's ruling is in direct opposition to and in direct conflict with the California Supreme Court ruling and therefore review is needed of this case.

**B. REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED TO RESOLVE A CONFLICT AMONG COURT OF APPEAL DECISIONS REGARDING WHEN A “TIMELY” REQUEST FOR CCP 998 COSTS MUST BE MADE.**

As made clear in *Maaso v. Signer* (2012) 203 Cal.App.4th 362 and Knight et al., Cal. Practice Guide: Alternative Dispute Resolution (The Rutter Group 2015). Paragraph 5:402.13-14 (citing *Maaso*), “[t]he arbitrator **must** be informed, however, of the rejected CCP § 998 offer **prior to making a final award** in order to impose any applicable costs ‘penalties’ . . . .” (*Ibid*, *emphases added*.)

Until this Opinion, the Second, Fourth, and even this Sixth District Courts of Appeal (and possibly others) consistently upheld *Maaso*.<sup>1</sup> The Opinion, then, contradicts *Maaso*, and its own prior holdings on this issue, without explanation.

The Opinion suggests that because it was allegedly “not practical” to ask the Arbitrator to issue an interim award, or otherwise reserve the right to bring a 998 motion, Appellant’s post-final award request, presented six (6) days after the final award was received by Appellant, was timely. In addition to ignoring the California Supreme Court’s position in *White* on the admissibility of CCP 998 offers, and *Maaso*, this holding ignores the amount of time that passed between the presentation of evidence, which concluded on November 13, 2014, the issuance of the final award on March 5, 2015, and the request on March 11, 2015.

---

<sup>1</sup> As these cases are unpublished, they will not be referenced.

In addition to the 90 days between the presentation of evidence and the final award, Appellant let six (6) days lapse before informing the Arbitrator of the CCP 998 offer issue. It is not only practical, but imperative that a party reserve the right to present evidence of the rejected CCP 998 offer prior to the close of evidence, and, in fact, Mr. Shivji had numerous opportunities and methods by which to accomplish this. Appellant simply failed to make any effort at all until six (6) days after a Final Award.

The Opinion concluded, without analysis or reference to the six (6) day lapse between the Final award and request, that “Client timely presented his section 998 claim to the arbitrator.” Six (6) days after a final award is clearly not timely. This is akin to a party asking to present new witnesses at trial 6 days after a court’s final ruling. Thus, the Opinion is silent on the issue of timeliness, which was discussed heavily in the briefing, and leaves open ended the deadline, if any, by which a post-final award request can be made. In doing so, the Opinion destroys the finality of final arbitration awards, rendering them meaningless, and the proceedings in arbitration indefinite. This hole in the analysis of “timeliness” needs resolution, particularly if post-final award requests for CCP 998 costs are now considered timely in the Sixth District.

**C. REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED TO PROVIDE GUIDANCE AS TO WHETHER A COURT IS PERMITTED TO CREATE A NEW MANDATE FOR A POST-FINAL ARBITRATION AWARD.**

“It is well settled that the scope of judicial review of arbitration awards is extremely narrow.” (*California Faculty Assn. v. Superior Court* (1998) 63 Cal.App.4th 935, 943; accord, *City of Palo Alto v. Service*

*Employees Internat. Union* (1999) 77 Cal.App.4th 327, 333 (*City of Palo Alto*.)

In *Moncharsh v. Heily & Blase*, (1992) 3 Cal.4th, the California Supreme Court “held judicial review of private, binding arbitration awards is generally limited to the statutory grounds for vacating (§ 1286.2) or correcting (§ 1286.6) an award” and “rejected the view that a court may vacate or correct the award because of the arbitrator’s legal or factual error, even an error appearing on the face of the award.” (*Moshonov v. Walsh* (2000) 22 Cal.4th 771, 775 (*Moshonov*), citing *Moncharsh, supra*, 3 Cal.4th at pp. 8-28.)

In direct contradiction to this, the Opinion second guesses the Arbitrator’s decision to deny costs and maintain the “final” status of his award, and asserts that the Arbitrator should have ruled on the 998 motion when presented with it six (6) days *after* the final award was received by Appellant.

However, the American Arbitration Association (AAA) Rules do not provide for such an after-final award. Rule 47(b) provides "In addition to a final award, the arbitrator may make other decisions, including interim, interlocutory, or partial rulings, orders, and awards.", each of which precede a Final Award, but no “after final” Awards. AAA Rule R-47 (page 28). The categorization of the order as “final award” suggests, by its definition, and mandates that it is the ultimate, conclusive, and last order. If the AAA intended to allow for after-final awards, it would have provided for them in Rule 47.

There is no procedure under the AAA Rules to modify final awards, except “to correct any clerical, typographical, or computational errors in the award.” AAA Rule R-50 (page 28-29). Here, the Court has created a new



set of AAA rules that have no cited legal basis, no standards and are entirely arbitrary and capricious.

Under the Court's theory (Opinion p. 20) if the proposed presentation of the Section 998 is not practical, the Court can simply ignore the statute and the AAA rules. The Court fails to cite any legal basis to ignore the clear intent of the legislature and to rewrite the AAA rules to create its new "after final" rule. In doing so, it creates new legal doctrine, without cited legal authority to cancel any law that does not have a practical procedure spelled out within its framework.

The Opinion states that it sees nothing in the Commercial Rules that prevents an Arbitration award from changing or "recharacterizing" (p. 29) from a final to a non-final award. (p. 27), erroneously holding that because the AAA Rules do not expressly prohibit such a thing, that it is permitted. This is a clear logical fallacy. Further, the words of the rules must be given weight, which the Opinion fails to do. Instead the Opinion suggests that Courts can act as a legislature, re-writing the AAA rules, which the Court has no power to do. In doing so, the Opinion fails to cite any authority for its ability to change the AAA rules. The AAA rules do not allow any post-final award; in fact, only interim, interlocutory, or partial rulings, orders, and awards are allowed (Rule 47), each of which can precede a final order. The Arbitrator made a clear determination that the Award in this case was final, and this Opinion has cited no authority for this "recharacterization" doctrine. There is nothing in the rules that allow the alchemy of a final award into a Interim or Partial final Award after issuance as the Court claims.

This completely upturns the arbitration system and runs afoul of the method by which rules and statutes have been interpreted and relevant case

law, which in this case are *White, Maaso, and Moncharsh* (“the parties’ expectation of finality from a binding arbitration requires that ‘judicial intervention in the arbitration process be minimized.’”)

The Opinion, then, reaches a flawed conclusion by holding that such an order is possible, and, in fact, mandatory. A change in the AAA Rules cannot and should not come from the Court, but rather from the American Arbitration Association itself, which would be done prior to a proceeding, not after a proceeding is completed, decided, and final.

For the foregoing reasons, review of this case should be undertaken to provide guidance as to whether a Court is permitted to create a new mandate for the AAA for a post-final Arbitration award.

### III. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

#### **A. The Civil Case**

This case arose over a dispute over attorney’s fees owed to Mr. Heimlich for patent work performed for Mr. Shivji pursuant to a legal services agreement dated August 8, 2003. Upon written demand of payment for outstanding fees owed, Mr. Heimlich sent the Mandatory Fee Arbitration letter to Mr. Shivji. Mr. Shivji did not avail himself of this procedure. Mr. Heimlich filed suit on September 10, 2012, for breach of contract, monies owed and common counts (Case No. 112CV231939). The case was litigated extensively in civil court for fourteen (14) months. During that time, Mr. Shivji sent a 998 Offer for \$30,000, which was not accepted, and filed a Motion for Summary Judgment in Court, which was denied by the Court. Thereafter, on November 14, 2013, the Court granted Heimlich’s Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings.

#### **B. The Arbitration**

After seeing that his defenses would not work in civil court, Mr.

Shivji decided to switch forums to Arbitration after 14 months of litigation. Mr. Shivji then filed a claim seeking \$176,000 in affirmative relief with American Arbitration Association (AAA) on November 18, 2013. The Superior Court ordered the parties to arbitration on May 29, 2014. The case was arbitrated and the Arbitrator entered a Final Award denying both Mr. Shivji's (\$176,000) and Mr. Heimlich's (\$125,000) claims, explicitly stating that "EACH SIDE WILL BEAR THEIR OWN ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS." The final award also stated, "This Award is intended to be a complete disposition of all claims and counterclaims submitted to this Arbitration. All claims not expressly granted herein are hereby[] denied." This became the Final Judgment of the Case.

### **C. Confirmation of the Arbitration Award**

Mr. Shivji did not present his 998 costs claims to the Arbitrator until six (6) days after the Final Award was already issued. The arbitrator responded by e-mail the next day. "Counsel, once I issued [m]y Final Award I no longer have jurisdiction to take any further action in this matter. As discussed in the Award, whatever may have been the costs, fees, etc. associated with the Santa Clara litigation were to be borne by the parties . . ."

Mr. Shivji moved to confirm the arbitration award. On May 25, 2015, the Superior Court confirmed the Arbitration Award and entered Judgment of the Arbitration Final Award.

### **D. Motion to Tax Costs**

After the Final Arbitration Award and Entry of Judgment, Shivji filed a Memorandum of Costs on April 24, 2015 seeking Shivji's 998 costs in Court. Then, Mr. Heimlich filed a Motion to Tax Costs on May 4, 2015. On June 16, 2015, the Superior Court denied the untimely request for CCP

998 costs, which were stricken and taxed to zero.

#### **E. Appeal to Sixth District Court of Appeals**

Mr. Shivji appealed the denial of his 998 Costs to the Sixth District Court of Appeals. The Opinion, dated May 31, 2017, and attached hereto as **Exhibit A**, reversed the trial court's ruling (and that of the Arbitrator), and partially vacated the award and ordered a hearing on the request for CCP 998 costs.

#### **F. Request for Rehearing**

Pursuant to California Court Rule 8.268(a), Respondent Alan Heimlich petitioned the Court of Appeal for rehearing of the Opinion filed May 31, 2017. The Petition for Rehearing was filed on June 15, 2017 and a Sur Petition filed on June 22, 2017 (after Heimlich located this Court's ruling in *White v. Western Title Ins. Co.* (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 870). The Court of Appeal declined rehearing on June 27, 2017.

### **IV. ARGUMENT**

The Sixth District Appellate Court's Opinion creates a split in the Courts of Appeal that runs counter to the California Supreme Court's prior holding in *White v. Western Title Ins. Co.* (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 870 (*White*), superseded by statute on another ground as stated in *Lee v. Fidelity National Title Ins. Co.* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 583, 596 and creates an immediate and extreme need for resolution by the California Supreme Court, in that it leaves wide open the question of when a "timely" request for CCP 998 costs must be made, as discussed in detail below.

Without immediate instruction from the California Supreme Court, each district, and each individual arbitrator, will be forced to "pick a side"

in determining whether to attempt to reserve the right to CCP 998 costs during arbitration, as clearly articulated in *Maaso v. Signer* (2012) 203 Cal.App.4th 362 (*Maaso*), and permitted in *White*, or wait until after a final ruling in arbitration, risking the loss of an award of CCP 998 costs in an effort to follow the Sixth District's flawed instructions articulated in this case.

This case merits review because, given the scope and potential impact of the Appellate Court's central holding, the Opinion threatens to produce unintended and harmful consequences for Appellant, and the entire arbitration system. Ultimately, the Opinion obliterates the finality of a final award in arbitration and runs contrary to established California Supreme Court precedent.

The Appellate Court's Opinion creates a hole in arbitration finality so large a truck could be driven through any arbitration award. One not happy with an arbitration award must merely raise something six (6), or more, days after a final award and any Arbitrator can simply "recharacterize" (the Opinion's language) its final award as not final. The Appellate Court's decision clearly ignores the California Supreme Court's prior holding in *White*, and the AAA rules, rewriting them with an arbitrary and capricious standard that allows changes to final awards without any legal basis stated for such changes.

For the reasons set forth above, the court has grounds to review the Sixth District's Opinion under California Rule of Court 8.500(b)(1), as it is necessary to secure uniformity of decision and settle an important question of law.


V. CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, Appellant respectfully requests that Court Grant Respondent's Petition for Review to (1) resolve a conflict split in the California district courts of appeal and (2) preserve the independence and finality of the arbitration process.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 10, 2017

Law Offices of Nicholas D. Heimlich

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nick Heimlich", written over a horizontal line.

Nick Heimlich

Attorney for Appellant

**CERTIFICATION OF WORD COUNT**

I, Nick Heimlich, Attorney for Respondent hereby certify that pursuant to Rule 8.204(c)(1) of the California Rules of Court, the enclosed brief of Respondent is produced using 13 point Roman type including footnotes and contains exactly 3206 words, as calculated by the computer program which produced said brief, which Counsel relies upon to determine the word count in this brief.



Date: 07/10/2017

---

Nicholas D. Heimlich  
Attorney for Petitioner, Alan Heimlich

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, the undersigned, under penalty of perjury, certify and declare: That I am a citizen of the United States, over 18 years of age, a resident of or employed in the County where the herein described mailing took place, and not a party to the within action.

That my business address is 5595 Winfield Blvd., Suite 110, San Jose, CA 95123. That on behalf of the Law Offices of Nicholas D. Heimlich, I served the foregoing document(s) described as: Petition for Review, on July 10, 2017, on the following persons in this action, by placing a true and accurate copy thereof addressed as follows, in the ordinary course of business at Law Offices of Nicholas D. Heimlich, placed in that designated area is picked up that same day for delivery the following business day:

**Via Electronic Filing and Mail Service:**

California Court of Appeal  
Sixth Appellate District  
333 W. Santa Clara Street, Suite 1060  
San Jose, CA 95113

**Via Mail Service, Electronic Service and Email:**

Omar Farooqui  
Ellahie & Farooqui LLP  
12 South First Street, Suite 600  
San Jose, CA 95113

**Via Mail Service and Court Filing:**


Superior Court of California  
Clerk, for Dept. 3, Judge Elfving  
191 North First Street  
San Jose, CA 95113

**Via Electronic Filing and 2 copies via Express Mail:**

Supreme Court of California  
350 McAllister, Room 1295  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4797

I declare that the above service was made at the direction of a member of the bar of this Court.

Executed on July 10, 2017, at San Jose, California.



---

Nick Heimlich



Exhibit A

Exhibit A

Exhibit A

**CERTIFIED FOR PUBLICATION**

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

ALAN HEIMLICH,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

SHIRAZ M. SHIVJI,

Defendant and Appellant.

H042641

(Santa Clara County

Super. Ct. No. 112CV 231939)

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The issue presented by this appeal is the recoverability of costs available under Code of Civil Procedure section 998 following an American Arbitration Association (“AAA”) award that denied requests by both sides for damages, costs, and attorney fees.<sup>1</sup>

Attorney Alan Heimlich (Attorney) filed this action seeking payment of unpaid fees from his client Shiraz M. Shivji (Client). Client filed an answer and, one year later, asked for arbitration pursuant to his retainer agreement with Attorney. The trial court compelled contractual arbitration that resulted in no recovery by either side. Six days after the arbitration award, Client asked the arbitrator to award him costs under section 998 because Attorney’s recovery was less favorable than a section 998 offer that Client made two months before

---

<sup>1</sup> Unspecified section references are to the Code of Civil Procedure.

demanding arbitration. When the arbitrator responded that he no longer had jurisdiction to take further action, Client asked the trial court to confirm the arbitration award and to award him section 998 costs as well. The court confirmed the arbitration award but, relying on *Maaso v. Signer* (2012) 203 Cal.App.4th 362 (*Maaso*), determined that Client failed to make a timely section 998 claim to the arbitrator and denied Client's request for section 998 costs. Client has appealed from this order after judgment.

We reject Attorney's suggestion that Client should have presented his section 998 request for costs to an arbitrator before the arbitration award was rendered, because an offer which is not accepted "cannot be given in evidence upon the trial or arbitration." (§ 998, subd. (b)(2).) Further, we find that in the course of his request to confirm the arbitration award Client established that the arbitrator had refused to hear any evidence of Attorney's rejection of Client's section 998 offer. Thus, we conclude that Client timely presented his section 998 claim to the arbitrator, the arbitrator should have reached the merits of that claim, and the arbitrator's refusal to hear evidence of the section 998 offer warranted partially vacating the arbitration award.

Therefore, we will reverse the order confirming the arbitration award and direct that an order be entered partially vacating the arbitration award to allow a determination of the section 998 request by the arbitrator or, if that avenue is not availing, by the court.

## **II. EVIDENCE ON MOTION**

### **A. THE ARBITRATION AGREEMENT**

In August 2003, Client retained Attorney to protect Client's intellectual property. The retainer agreement included the following arbitration provision.

"8. Arbitration. The client and our firm agree that all disputes or claims of any nature whatsoever, including but not limited to those relating to our fees or the adequacy or appropriateness of our services, shall be resolved by private and final binding arbitration before either JAMS or the American Arbitration Association in

San Francisco, California in accordance with their rules -- the client may choose one of these two providers. The arbitrator must decide all disputes in accordance with California law and shall have power to decide all matters, including arbitrability. . . .” (Capitalization omitted.)

## **B. COMMENCEMENT OF THIS LAWSUIT**

For a number of years after being retained, Attorney assisted Client with filing patent applications and forming a corporation, Giotti, Inc., to hold the patents. A dispute arose over Attorney’s fees. Notwithstanding the above arbitration provision, Attorney filed a form complaint in the Santa Clara County Superior Court on September 10, 2012 seeking recovery for unpaid invoices.<sup>2</sup> The complaint alleged a breach of contract and a common count for services rendered and an open book account. Attorney prayed for damages of \$125,244.59, interest on the damages, and costs of suit, but not attorney fees. Client filed a form answer to the complaint that alleged 21 affirmative defenses. Client prayed for costs of suit and reasonable attorney fees, despite the fact that the retainer agreement did not provide for the prevailing party in any dispute to recover attorney fees or costs.<sup>3</sup>

On September 18, 2013, Client sent Attorney an offer to compromise the action by allowing a judgment providing that Client pay “the amount of thirty

---

<sup>2</sup> Attorney’s brief asserts that, before filing suit, he sent Client a “Mandatory Fee Arbitration letter” and Client “did not avail himself of this procedure.” This assertion lacks support in the appellate appendices provided by the parties. Attorney is presumably referring to the Mandatory Fee Arbitration Act set out at Business and Professions Code section 6200 et seq., under which “whereas a client cannot be forced . . . to arbitrate a dispute concerning legal fees, at the client’s election an unwilling attorney can be forced to do so.” (*Aguilar v. Lerner* (2004) 32 Cal.4th 974, 984.)

<sup>3</sup> No cross-complaint appears in the appendices that constitute the record on appeal.

thousand and one (\$30,001.00) dollars, including all taxable costs of suit to date of acceptance,” with each party to bear its own attorney fees and costs.

On November 1, 2013, the trial court denied Client’s motion for summary judgment. On November 14, 2013, the court denied Attorney’s motion for judgment on the pleadings, except as to affirmative defenses 7 through 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, and 21. The trial court also vacated a December 2013 trial date. On January 31, 2014, Attorney filed a first amended complaint that added two causes of action for fraud and another for declaratory relief.

### **C. THE ARBITRATION PROCEEDINGS**

One year after Client filed his answer, on November 18, 2013, he demanded arbitration of the dispute on an AAA form entitled “Commercial Arbitration Rules.”<sup>4</sup> Attorney objected to Client’s demand.

On April 4, 2014, in response to Attorney’s objection, an AAA arbitrator decided that it was up to the trial court to determine whether Client had waived arbitration by participating in this action. On May 29, 2014, the trial court granted Client’s motion to compel arbitration and stay this action pending arbitration.

In the arbitration proceedings, Client filed a 21-page statement of claims. Client alleged that Attorney had achieved approval of only one of Client’s 108 patent claims. Client paid Attorney \$16,867.78 between September 3, 2003 and August 27, 2004. In September 2005, Client incorporated Giotti and, between November 26, 2005 and May 22, 2009, Giotti paid Attorney \$159,697.44 for his services. Client accused Attorney of unauthorized flat fee billing, double billing, unilateral fee increases, delayed billing, and inflated billing. Client alleged breaches of contract, fiduciary duty, and the duty of good faith and fair dealing,

---

<sup>4</sup> In requested supplemental briefs, the parties have essentially stipulated that their arbitration was conducted under the AAA’s Commercial Arbitration Rules effective on October 1, 2013 and that this court can take judicial notice of those Rules.

and also alleged unlawful business practices. Client requested restitution for unjust enrichment, a refund of amounts paid, punitive damages, and “all costs of suit incurred herein.” There is no indication that Client specifically claimed entitlement to costs under section 998 either in his statement of claims or any other pleading preceding the arbitrator’s decision.

Attorney filed an 18-page “Counterclaim” in arbitration that restated the five causes of action in his amended civil complaint and added claims for indemnification and comparative fault. Attorney sought to recover for unpaid invoices, attorney fees, “Costs of this Arbitration and the Lawsuit in Santa Clara County . . . per Civil Code Section 3300, and [Attorney’s] costs of the lawsuit and this arbitration per California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1032.”

After hearing six days of evidence, the AAA arbitrator issued an eight-page decision on March 5, 2015. The award was titled as from a “Commercial Arbitration Tribunal.” The arbitrator determined that Attorney helped Client form a corporation, Giotti, Inc., to which Client transferred his interest in four patents. After late November 2005, an attorney-client relationship was created between Attorney and Giotti. Attorney was awarded nothing on his counterclaims against Client because “[t]he legal services provided by [Attorney] from late November, 2005 through May, 2007 were performed for the benefit of Giotti, Inc. and the obligation to pay for those services rested with Giotti, Inc.,” which Attorney had not named as a party in his complaint or his counterclaim.

The arbitrator awarded Client \$0 on his claims against Attorney. As to arbitration expenses, “[t]he administrative fees and expenses of the [AAA] totaling \$9,575.00 shall be borne as incurred and the arbitration compensation totaling \$22,800.00 shall be borne as incurred. Each side will bear their own attorneys’ fees and costs.” (Capitalization omitted.) As to prearbitration expenses, the arbitrator ruled that, while Attorney had breached the arbitration agreement by filing this lawsuit, Client could have remedied the breach by raising the issue immediately. “Accordingly, both parties are at fault for any expenses incurred in

that litigation.” The award also stated, “This Award is intended to be a complete disposition of all claims and counterclaims submitted to this Arbitration. All claims not expressly granted herein are hereby[] denied.”

Six days after the award, on March 11, 2015, Client sent an e-mail to the arbitrator stating in part, “There is one open matter that has to do with the award of costs pursuant to CCP § 998 and the procedure to follow regarding the same.” “Our understanding is that the demand for an award for recovery of these costs should be submitted to the Arbitrator rather than directly to the Court. Your confirmation of this procedure will be appreciated.”

The arbitrator responded by e-mail the following day. “Counsel, once I issued [m]y Final Award I no longer have jurisdiction to take any further action in this matter. As discussed in the Award, whatever may have been the costs, fees, etc. associated with the Santa Clara litigation were to be borne by the parties . . . .”

#### **D. MOTION SEEKING COSTS AND CONFIRMATION OF AWARD**

On April 24, 2015, Client filed a motion asking the court to resume jurisdiction in the case, confirm the arbitration award, and “Grant Interest and Costs Pursuant to CCP §998.” Client’s motion explained that the arbitrator had rejected his request to award costs under section 998 due to a lack of jurisdiction. Client submitted a memorandum of costs totaling \$76,684.02, which included witness fees of \$26,668.01, AAA fees of \$23,550.00, and deposition costs of \$11,485.82.<sup>5</sup> Attorney opposed this request and moved to strike or tax costs. Client filed a reply.

By order dated May 27, 2015, the court confirmed the arbitration award, “notwithstanding consideration of any motions pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 998.”

---

<sup>5</sup> It appears that Client’s request for costs was limited to costs through the arbitration proceedings, not including the subsequent court proceedings.

At a hearing on costs on June 16, 2015, the court’s tentative ruling was: “I came to the conclusion that the leading case cited by plaintiff was on point and the one that the Court should follow, [is the] Maaso vs Signer case, 203 Cal.App.4th, 362. Basically, when the matter went to the arbitrator, it was [i]ncumbent upon the defendant to raise the CCP 998 issue with the arbitrator on a timely basis. In the view of the arbitrator, it got raised late after the award.” The court took the matter under submission and later the same day denied the remainder of Client’s motion, granted Attorney’s motion to tax costs, and ordered each party to bear their own costs and attorney fees as ordered by the arbitrator.

### **III. AWARDING COSTS UNDER SECTION 998 AFTER ARBITRATION**

#### **A. APPLICABLE STATUTORY SCHEMES**

Three statutory schemes, all in the Code of Civil Procedure, are relevant to our analysis of the recoverability of costs in judicial proceedings to confirm, correct, or vacate arbitration awards. One is the general scheme authorizing recovery of costs of litigation beginning with section 1021. Another is California’s Arbitration Act (“CAA”) which begins at section 1280. The third is section 998.

Chapter 6 of Title 14 of Part 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure governs the recovery of costs of litigation. Section 1032, subdivision (b) sets forth the general rule that the party prevailing “in any action or proceeding” “is entitled as a matter of right to recover costs . . . .” Section 1032, subdivision (a) identifies which party has prevailed in four sets of circumstances and otherwise leaves the determination of the prevailing party to the trial court’s discretion. (*deSaulles v. Community Hosp. of Monterey Peninsula* (2016) 62 Cal.4th 1140, 1147.) Section 1033.5 was enacted in 1986 to codify in one place existing law concerning which costs are allowable. (*Davis v. KGO-T.V., Inc.* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 436, 441, disapproved on another ground by *Williams v. Chino Valley Independent Fire Dist.* (2015) 61 Cal.4th 97, 107.) It is worth noting that section 1033.5, subdivision (a)(10) currently includes as allowable costs “Attorney’s fees, when authorized by . . . :



[¶] (A) Contract. [¶] (B) Statute. [¶] (C) Law,” as many published cases about arbitration costs involve attorney fees.<sup>6</sup>

Section 998 is understood to be an exception to section 1032. Subdivision (a) of section 998 states, “The costs allowed under Sections 1031 and 1032 shall be withheld or augmented as provided in this section.” *Scott Co. of California v. Blount, Inc.* (1999) 20 Cal.4th 1103 (*Scott Co.*) explained: “Section 998 modifies the general rule of section 1032 that only the prevailing party recovers its costs.” (*Scott Co.*, at p. 1112.) “It is the very essence of section 998 that, to encourage both the making and the acceptance of reasonable settlement offers, a losing defendant whose settlement offer exceeds the judgment is treated for purposes of postoffer costs *as if* it were the prevailing party.” (*Scott Co.*, at p. 1114.) The purpose of section 998 “ ‘is to encourage settlement by providing a strong financial disincentive to a party—whether it be a plaintiff or a defendant — who fails to achieve a better result than that party could have achieved by accepting his or her opponent’s settlement offer. (This is the stick. The carrot is that by awarding costs to the putative settler the statute provides a financial incentive to make reasonable settlement offers.)’ ” (*Scott Co.*, at p. 1116; *Pilimai v. Famers Ins. Exchange Co.* (2006) 39 Cal.4th 133, 139 (*Pilimai*).

In 1997, section 998 was amended to authorize arbitrators as well as courts to impose costs on parties whose arbitration awards were no more favorable than

---

<sup>6</sup> Fees authorized by contract were added to the statute in 1990. (Stats. 1990, ch. 804, § 1, p. 3551.) The same 1990 amendment also resolved confusion about how to recover such fees by specifying in section 1033.5, subdivision (b)(5) that contractual attorney fees “shall be fixed either upon a noticed motion or upon entry of a default judgment, unless otherwise provided by stipulation of the parties.” (Stats. 1990, ch. 804, § 1, p. 3552.)

settlement offers they had rejected.<sup>7</sup> These amendments superseded the holding in *Woodard v. Southern Cal. Permanente Medical Group* (1985) 171 Cal.App.3d 656 (*Woodard*) “that section 998 and Civil Code section 3291 do not apply to [contractual] arbitration.” (*Id.* at p. 666.)

Section 1293.2, part of the CAA, specifically makes the cost award provisions of sections 1032 and 1033.5 applicable in judicial proceedings to

---

<sup>7</sup> 1997 amendments of section 998 (Stats. 1997, ch. 892, § 1, pp. 6389-6391) italicized below specifically authorized arbitrators to award costs under section 998, providing in pertinent part:

“(b) Not less than 10 days prior to commencement of trial *or arbitration (as provided in Section 1281 or 1295) of a dispute to be resolved by arbitration*, any party may serve an offer in writing upon any other party to the action to allow judgment to be taken *or an award to be entered* in accordance with the terms and conditions stated at that time. The written offer shall include a statement of the offer, containing the terms and conditions of the judgment *or award*, and a provision that allows the accepting party to indicate acceptance of the offer by signing a statement that the offer is accepted. . . .

“(1) If the offer is accepted, the offer with proof of acceptance shall be filed and the clerk or the judge shall enter judgment accordingly. *In the case of an arbitration, the offer with proof of acceptance shall be filed with the arbitrator or arbitrators who shall promptly render an award accordingly.*

“(2) If the offer is not accepted prior to trial or arbitration or within 30 days after it is made, whichever occurs first, it shall be deemed withdrawn, and cannot be given in evidence upon the trial *or arbitration.*

“ . . . [¶]

“(c)(1) If an offer made by a defendant is not accepted and the plaintiff fails to obtain a more favorable judgment *or award*, the plaintiff shall not recover his or her postoffer costs and shall pay the defendant’s costs from the time of the offer. In addition, in any action or proceeding other than an eminent domain action, the court *or arbitrator*, in its discretion, may require the plaintiff to pay a reasonable sum to cover postoffer costs of the services of expert witnesses, who are not regular employees of any party, actually incurred and reasonably necessary in either, or both, preparation for trial *or arbitration*, or during trial *or arbitration*, of the case by the defendant.

“ . . . [¶]”

compel contractual arbitration and to confirm, correct, or vacate contractual arbitration awards. Section 1293.2 states, “The court shall award costs upon any judicial proceeding under this title as provided in Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 1021) of Title 14 of Part 2 of this code.” Section 1293.2 has been the basis for awarding litigation costs to parties who succeeded in resisting motions to compel arbitration<sup>8</sup> and also in obtaining confirmation<sup>9</sup> and vacation<sup>10</sup> of arbitration awards.<sup>11</sup>

## **B. COSTS RECOVERABLE IN POST-ARBITRATION JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS**

Though parties who prevail in judicial proceedings to confirm an arbitration award are entitled to recover the costs for those proceedings, those parties have usually been denied recovery of their arbitration costs despite prevailing in the arbitration based on direct or indirect reliance on section 1284.2 of the CAA,

---

<sup>8</sup> *Otay River Constructors v. San Diego Expressway* (2008) 158 Cal.App.4th 796, 807 [“Expressway obtained a ‘‘simple, unqualified win’’ on the only contract claim at issue in the action—whether to compel arbitration under the Coordination Agreement.”].

<sup>9</sup> *Carole Ring & Associates v. Nicastro* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 253, 261 (*Nicastro*) [“Because Nicastro was the prevailing party as a matter of law, the mandatory language of the contractual attorney fees clause and section 1293.2 entitle Nicastro to reasonable attorney fees and costs incurred in post-arbitration judicial proceedings.”]; *Corona v. Amherst Partners* (2003) 107 Cal.App.4th 701, 707 (*Corona*) [“Corona was entitled to recover his attorney fees and costs relating to the judicial proceedings.”].

<sup>10</sup> *Marcus & Millichap Real Estate Investment Brokerage Co. v. Woodman Investment Group* (2005) 129 Cal.App.4th 508, 514 (*Marcus & Millichap*) [award of costs and attorney fees upheld].

<sup>11</sup> Client relies on *Guevara v. Brand* (1992) 8 Cal.App.4th 995, a decision by this court, as authorizing a judicial award of costs “after entry of judgment on a judicial arbitration award.” (*Id.* at p. 996.) Because that case involved the distinct procedure of judicial arbitration and that statute (§§ 1141.10 through 1141.31) has its own costs provisions (§§ 1141.21, 1141.28), it affords us no guidance for contractual arbitration and the costs available under section 1293.2.

which states: “Unless the arbitration agreement otherwise provides or the parties to the arbitration otherwise agree, each party to the arbitration shall pay his pro rata share of the expenses and fees of the neutral arbitrator, together with other expenses of the arbitration incurred or approved by the neutral arbitrator, not including counsel fees or witness fees or other expenses incurred by a party for his own benefit.” We will review this precedent and explain how the California Supreme Court has established that section 998 creates an exception to section 1284.2.

In *Dickinson v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals* (1980) 112 Cal.App.3d 952 (*Dickinson*) a patient who prevailed against a hospital in medical malpractice arbitration asked the court to confirm his award and also correct it to the extent the arbitrators denied him recovery of costs. The Second District Court of Appeal (Div. Five) determined that an award of arbitration costs was precluded by section 1284.2. (*Dickinson*, at p. 954.) The court explained: “In arbitration matters, the Legislature has carefully distinguished between costs incurred in the arbitration and costs incurred in superior court to enforce an arbitration award. (Compare . . . , § 1284.2 with . . . , § 1293.2; see *McRae v. Superior Court* (1963) 221 Cal.App.2d 166, 171-172 [*McRae*]; *Tipton v. Systron Donner Corp.* (1979) 99 Cal.App.3d 501, 507 [*Tipton*]; [citation].)” (*Dickinson*, at p. 954.)<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> The comparisons of sections 1284.2 and 1293.2 in *McRae* and *Tipton* on which *Dickinson* relied were dictum. Unlike *Dickinson*, neither opinion relied on section 1284.2 to deny a party’s request for arbitration costs.

In *McRae, supra*, 221 Cal.App.2d 166, the issue was whether a party to ongoing arbitration could conduct discovery in the related lawsuit that was stayed pending the arbitration. The opinion contrasted the statutes to make the point that in the CAA, the Legislature had distinguished “judicial proceedings” referenced in section 1293.2 from the underlying arbitration. (*Id.* at p. 172.)

In *Tipton, supra*, 99 Cal.App.3d 501, the trial court awarded the parties that prevailed in the arbitration “the costs of both the arbitration and the court proceedings” for obtaining confirmation of the award. (*Id.* at p. 507.) Citing the

(Continued)

In *Austin v. Allstate Ins. Co.* (1993) 16 Cal.App.4th 1812 (*Austin*), after an insured obtained a damage award in arbitration under uninsured motorist coverage, the insured sought arbitration costs after having the award confirmed. (*Id.* at p. 1814.) The Second District Court of Appeal (Div. Two) relied on the comparison of sections 1284.2 and 1293.2 in *Dickinson* and *Tipton* in concluding, “Here, the insurance policy, in harmony with . . . section 1284.2, specified that ‘Costs, including attorney fees, are to be paid by the party incurring them.’ [fn. omitted] Thus, appellant is not entitled to recover her costs of arbitration unless a different rule is mandated by the uninsured motorist statute.” (*Id.* at p. 1816.) The court distinguished cases from other jurisdictions, stating “in none of the cases cited were there statutes similar to . . . sections 1284.2 and 1292.3 indicating a legislative policy requiring parties to bear their own costs in arbitration.” (*Austin*, at p. 1817.)

Section 1284.2 does contemplate that the parties may make a different agreement about costs and they did so in *DiMarco v. Chaney* (1995) 31 Cal.App.4th 1809 (*DiMarco*), on which Attorney relies. There a real-estate seller prevailed in arbitration against a buyer and asked the trial court to correct the arbitration award, as the arbitrator had denied attorney fees and costs to the party he had found to have prevailed, despite a contract provision that the prevailing party “shall be entitled to reasonable attorney’s fees . . . .” (*Id.* at pp. 1812, 1815.) The Second District Court of Appeal (Div. Three) concluded that the arbitrator

---

two statutes, the court stated, “The California arbitration statutes distinguish between arbitration costs and costs of related judicial proceedings.” (*Ibid.*) However, the appellate court interpreted the agreement between the parties as vesting “the court with jurisdiction to make the dual cost award.” (*Id.* at p. 508.) It was a case where the parties had otherwise agreed about the costs of arbitration.

Cases postdating *Dickinson* have quoted or paraphrased its distinction of sections 1284.2 and 1293.2 in dictum. (E.g., *Woodard, supra*, 171 Cal.App.3d at p. 665.)

had exceeded his powers in denying the request for attorney fees contractually due after finding one party had prevailed. (*Id.* at p. 1811.) The opinion quoted *Dickinson* in contrasting sections 1284.2 and 1293.2 in order to conclude that the noticed motion procedure in section 1033.5 does not apply in arbitration proceedings. “[I]t would appear the requirement of a noticed motion under section 1033.5 applies to a request in the superior court for attorney fees incurred in proceedings to correct, vacate or confirm an arbitration award, not to a request for attorney fees incurred in the underlying arbitration. The determination of a claim for attorney fees incurred in prosecuting or defending the underlying arbitration proceeding is within the purview of the arbitrator, rendering the procedure of section 1033.5 inapplicable.” (*DiMarco*, at p. 1817.)

*DiMarco* created a bifurcated procedure for recovering the costs of arbitration and litigation. “Once the arbitrator makes a determination as to the amount of attorney fees and costs to which Chaney is entitled for the arbitration proceeding, Chaney may move in the superior court to confirm the award. At that juncture, Chaney may bring a noticed motion pursuant to sections 1033.5 and 1293.2 to recover the reasonable amount of the attorney fees and costs which she incurred *in judicial proceedings*.” (*DiMarco*, *supra*, 31 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1817-1818.) *DiMarco* reversed a trial court’s award of attorney fees attributable to the arbitration, and remanded the matter “to the trial court with directions to remand to the arbitrator for a determination of the amount of attorney fees and costs to which Chaney is entitled for the arbitration proceedings . . . .” (*Id.* at p. 1818.)

Later decisions have followed these earlier decisions without expressly invoking section 1284.2. In *Nicastro*, *supra*, 87 Cal.App.4th 253, on which Client relies, a client had successfully resisted a motion by his real estate broker to vacate an arbitration award that had denied a commission to the broker. Consistent with its *DiMarco* decision, the Second District Court of Appeal (Div. Three) concluded that the trial court erred in denying the prevailing client “reasonable attorney fees

and costs incurred in postarbitration judicial proceedings” under section 1293.2. (*Nicastro*, at p. 261.)<sup>13</sup>

Among this precedent, only *Dickinson* and *Austin* denied judicial awards of arbitration costs based on section 1284.2. In the later 2006 decision of *Pilimai*, *supra*, 39 Cal.4th 133, on which Client relies, the California Supreme Court has cast doubt on those decisions or at least identified section 998 as an exception to section 1284.2, as it is to section 1032. The Supreme Court answered four questions: “(1) whether the cost-shifting provisions of . . . section 998 apply to [uninsured motorist] arbitrations [pursuant to Insurance Code section 11580.2]; (2) whether the award of such costs, together with the arbitration award, can exceed an insurer’s ‘maximum liability’ under Insurance Code section 11580.2, subdivision (p)(4) . . . ; (3) whether prejudgment interest pursuant to Civil Code section 3291 is available for an uninsured motorist arbitration; and (4) whether, if costs are available under . . . section 998, those costs include deposition and exhibit preparation costs.” (*Pilimai*, at p. 136.)

Our concern with *Pilimai* is about the court’s discussion of the types of costs that are recoverable postarbitration. In that case, in uninsured motorist arbitration proceedings an insured obtained a policy limit award that was silent on the subject of costs. (*Pilimai*, *supra*, 39 Cal.4th at p. 137.) The insured asked a court to confirm the award and to award arbitration costs based on section 998. The trial court determined that the insured had prevailed under section 998, but denied a cost award because it would exceed the policy limit authorized in

---

<sup>13</sup> Relying on *Nicastro* and section 1293.2, the Second District Court of Appeal (Div. Seven) in *Marcus & Millichap*, *supra*, 129 Cal.App.4th at pages 513-514, and the Fourth District Court of Appeal (Div. One) in *Corona*, *supra*, 107 Cal.App.4th at page 707, concluded that parties who prevailed in having arbitration awards either vacated (*Marcus & Millichap*) or confirmed (*Corona*) were entitled to recover their reasonable attorney fees and costs arising in the judicial proceedings.

Insurance Code section 11580.2, subdivision (p)(4). (*Pilimai*, at p. 138.) The Supreme Court first determined that uninsured motorist arbitration, though mandated by statute, is still contractual arbitration to which section 998 applies. (*Pilimai*, at pp. 141-142.) The court next determined that the maximum liability provision in the Insurance Code was not intended to limit cost awards under section 998. (*Pilimai*, at p. 145.)

As to the types of costs available, *Pilimai* reasoned that the costs available under section 998 include the costs enumerated under section 1033.5. (*Pilimai*, *supra*, 39 Cal.4th at p. 148.) The insurer relied on *Austin* in arguing that section 1284.2 precludes awarding arbitration costs for exhibits and depositions, while conceding the availability of expert witness costs as provided by section 998, subdivision (d). (*Pilimai*, at pp. 148-149.) The court responded: “*Austin* is distinguishable from the present case inasmuch as it concerned an award of costs pursuant to . . . section 1032. Here, we address costs awarded pursuant to . . . section 998, which now authorizes the award of costs after an arbitration.” (*Pilimai*, at p. 149.)<sup>14</sup> Section 998, subdivision (d) specifically authorizes a discretionary award of the costs of expert witnesses. “Reading this section with . . . section 998, subdivision (a), it is apparent that the types of costs available to an arbitration plaintiff are those costs available under . . . section 1032, as enumerated in . . . section 1033.5.” (*Pilimai*, at pp. 149-150.)

“Moreover, all that . . . section 1284.2 says about the kinds of costs at issue here —‘expenses incurred by a party for his own benefit’—is that such costs are not to be included in the costs that the parties are to share.” (*Pilimai*, *supra*, 39 Cal.4th at p. 150.) “[W]hile it is true, as the *Austin* court observed, that no provision of the CAA authorizes the award of arbitration costs absent agreement, .

---

<sup>14</sup> In distinguishing *Austin*, the Supreme Court did not discuss *Dickinson*, on which *Austin* had relied.



. . . section 998 itself provides the statutory authorization for such costs.” (*Pilimai*, at p. 150.) “We . . . conclude that arbitration plaintiffs such as *Pilimai* are eligible for deposition and exhibit preparation costs pursuant to . . . section 998, subdivision (d).” (*Pilimai*, at p. 151.) The Supreme Court remanded with directions “*to the trial court to determine the proper cost award. . .*” (*Id.* at p. 152; our emphasis.)

We recognize, as Attorney points out, there was no argument in *Pilimai* that the insured should have asked the arbitrator, rather than the court, for an award of costs under section 998. Of course an appellate opinion must be understood in light of the issues presented to the court and it does not serve as authority for issues not considered. (*Kinsman v. Unocal Corp.* (2005) 37 Cal.4th 659, 680; *Fairbanks v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 56, 64.) *Pilimai* establishes, at the very least, that trial courts have the authority in arbitration confirmation proceedings to award costs of arbitration under section 998 when such a request has not been submitted to or decided by an arbitrator. It also establishes that whatever the true scope of section 1284.2, section 998 is a statutory exception to any requirement that parties bear their own arbitration costs.

### **C. THE PROCEDURE FOR RECOVERING ARBITRATION COSTS**

Cases predating and postdating *Pilimai* have concluded for policy reasons that any award of arbitration costs should be made by the arbitrator without focusing on the timing or procedure of making such a request of the arbitrator.

As noted, the decision in *DiMarco*, *supra*, 31 Cal.App.4th 1809, where a request for an award of attorney fees had been presented to the arbitrator, was premised on the arbitrator being responsible for awarding any attorney fees due for prevailing in an arbitration. “An award of attorney fees for the arbitration itself is within the arbitrator’s purview.” (*Id.* at p. 1816.) “Thus, the issue of the *amount* of attorney fees and costs to be awarded for the arbitration proceeding was properly a matter for the arbitrator.” (*Ibid.*) “Further, not only is the determination as to the amount properly within the purview of the arbitrator, but

we observe it is the arbitrator, not the trial court, which is best situated to determine the amount of reasonable attorney fees and costs to be awarded for the conduct of the arbitration proceeding.” (*Id.* at pp. 1816-1817.)

*Corona, supra*, 107 Cal.App.4th 701, on which Attorney relies, did not mention *DiMarco* or section 1284.2 in answering “no” to what it called an issue “of first impression in California: where a party is required by contract to submit a dispute to binding arbitration, but does not request that the arbitrator decide his entitlement to attorney fees even though that issue was part of the submission, may a trial court nonetheless determine that issue and make an award of fees and costs incurred in the arbitration?” (*Corona*, at pp. 703-704.) *Corona* instead articulated a more general policy basis for its conclusion. The CAA, particularly section 1286, limits judicial review of arbitration awards to confirming, correcting, or vacating them. (*Corona, supra*, at p. 706.) “Under the statutory scheme, a party’s failure to request the arbitrator to determine a particular issue within the scope of the arbitration is not a basis for vacating or correcting an award.” (*Ibid.*) “Such an interpretation of the applicable statutes promotes the Legislature’s determination that there is a “strong public policy in favor of arbitration as a speedy and relatively inexpensive means of dispute resolution.”” (*Ibid.*, quoting *Moncharsh v. Heily & Blase* (1992) 3 Cal.4th 1, 9.)

In *Maaso, supra*, 203 Cal.App.4th 362, on which the trial court and Attorney relied, the Second District Court of Appeal (Div. Two) followed *DiMarco* and *Corona* when a party sought a judicial award of arbitration costs under section 998. That case involved two contractual arbitrations of a medical malpractice claim, because the trial court had vacated the original arbitration award due to improper conduct by one of the party-arbitrators. (*Maaso*, at p. 368.) “During the course of the [second] arbitration proceedings Maaso’s counsel advised the panel that Maaso had previously made a section 998 offer that was rejected by [the defendant], without stating the amount of the offer. Maaso did not request that the arbitrators rule on the issue of section 998 costs or seek to present

evidence on the issue.” (*Maaso*, at pp. 368-369.) The arbitrators’ award provided that costs and fees were according to the arbitration agreement. *Maaso* petitioned the court to confirm the award and to award section 998 costs. (*Maaso*, at p. 369.) The trial court granted the defendant’s motion to tax costs, determining “that all costs associated with the arbitration, including section 998 costs, were within the sole purview of the arbitrators and not the court.” (*Id.* at p. 369.)

*Maaso* quoted with approval what we have quoted above from *Corona* regarding the limited scope of judicial review of arbitration awards and the policy served by requiring presentation of all issues to the arbitrator. (*Maaso*, *supra*, 203 Cal.App.4th at pp. 377-378.) The court reasoned, “Although *Maaso* styled his petition as one to ‘confirm’ the award, he essentially sought ‘correction’ of the award by asking the court to add costs and interest not awarded by the panel, and which were in fact inconsistent with the panel’s award.” (*Id.* at p. 378.) The court noted the limited grounds for correcting an arbitration award in section 1286.6<sup>15</sup> and also stated, “where the entitlement to attorney fees is within the scope of the issues submitted to binding arbitration, arbitrators do not ‘“exceed [ ] their powers”’ by denying a party’s request for attorney fees, ‘even where such a denial order would be reversible legal error if made by a court in civil litigation.’ (*Moore v. First Bank of San Luis Obispo* (2000) 22 Cal.4th 782, 784 [*Moore*]; *Moshonov v. Walsh* [(2000)] 22 Cal.4th [771,] 773 [*Moshonov*].)” (*Maaso*, at p. 378.)

---

<sup>15</sup> Section 1286.6 states that “the court, unless it vacates the award pursuant to Section 1286.2, shall correct the award and confirm it as corrected if the court determines that:

“(a) There was an evident miscalculation of figures or an evident mistake in the description of any person, thing or property referred to in the award;

“(b) The arbitrators exceeded their powers but the award may be corrected without affecting the merits of the decision upon the controversy submitted; or

“(c) The award is imperfect in a matter of form, not affecting the merits of the controversy.”

*Maaso* also quoted from *DiMarco* regarding the arbitrator being best situated to determine the amounts of reasonable attorney fees and expert witness costs and quoted with approval the trial court's statement that it would encourage forum shopping if section 998 costs after arbitration could be sought from either the arbitrator or a court. (*Id.* at p. 379.)

The court also stated, "The cases on which *Maaso* relies do not assist him. In *Pilimai v. Farmers Ins. Exchange Co.* (2006) 39 Cal.4th 133, the court was not called upon to decide whether it was for the court or the arbitrator to make an award of section 998 costs, but to address other issues, including whether the cost-shifting provisions of section 998 and . . . section 1032 applied to uninsured motorist arbitrations mandated by Insurance Code section 11580.2." (*Maaso, supra*, 203 Cal.App.4th at p. 379.)

We do not agree with this indication that *Pilimai* is irrelevant, but we do agree with the policy that when a party has agreed to an alternative dispute resolution mechanism like arbitration and has broadly agreed to submit all issues to arbitration, then the party should submit all issues to arbitration, including a request for costs under section 998. Such a requirement serves "the principle of arbitral finality. . . ." (*Moshonow, supra*, 22 Cal.4th at p. 776.)

But we do not see in *Maaso* a discussion of practical and legal restrictions on presenting a request for costs under section 998. Under the terms of the statute, an arbitrator cannot compare the favorability of an arbitration award to a rejected offer of settlement until after the award is made. A section 998 determination necessarily must postdate an arbitration award.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> In court, California Rules of Court governing prejudgment costs available under section 1032 contemplate serving a memorandum of costs within the earliest of either 15 days after service of the notice of entry of judgment or 180 days after entry of judgment. (Rule 3.1700(a) (formerly rule 870); *Jones v. John Crane, Inc.* (2005) 132 Cal.App.4th 990, 1012.) *Anthony v. City of Los Angeles*

(Continued)

In addition, we reiterate that the statute states in part, “If the offer is not accepted prior to trial or arbitration or within 30 days after it is made, whichever occurs first, *it shall be deemed withdrawn, and cannot be given in evidence upon the trial or arbitration.*” (§ 998, subd. (b)(2); our emphasis.) As Client points out, a literal application of subdivision (b)(2) would prohibit a party from submitting a request for section 998 costs as an issue in advance of an arbitration hearing or even asking the arbitrator to reserve jurisdiction to make such an award. At oral argument, Attorney proposed that, to comply with section 998, a party should ask the arbitrator to make an interim award without answering the arbitrator’s expected questions about why. We do not regard this as a reasonable, workable proposal. The best practice to avoid violating section 998, subdivision (b)(2) would be to present evidence of a rejected section 998 offer after an arbitration award resolves the underlying dispute.

Relying on *Maaso*, the trial court’s tentative ruling was that “it was [i]ncumbent upon the defendant to raise the CCP 998 issue with the arbitrator on a timely basis.” Attorney contends, “The fact that [Client’s] counsel did not properly place the CCP §998 offer before the arbitrator before his award was issued and his jurisdiction extinguished is not the arbitrator’s or court’s fault. There are well established procedures to make the arbitrator aware of a CCP §998 offer before the arbitrator renders a final award. [Client] merely needed to inform the Arbitrator at the pre-hearing brief, the closing brief or the reply brief or during the multiple days of arbitration hearings that there was a CCP Section 998 offer applicable to this case and that the Arbitrator should issue an interim or partial final award retaining jurisdiction to review any CCP Section 998 offer and

---

(2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 1011 has pointed out that the Judicial Council Memorandum of Costs (Worksheet) includes expert fees awarded under section 998. (*Id.* at p. 1016.) There is a different rule addressing post-judgment motions claiming contractual attorney fees. (Rule 3.1702(b).)

briefing on that subject after an award on the merits is issued.” We do not believe that such a pre-award request or alert would be consistent with the evidentiary restriction in section 998, subdivision (b)(2).

We requested supplemental briefing about whether *Maaso* considered this evidentiary restriction. Attorney correctly notes that *Maaso, supra*, 203 Cal.App.4th 362 did quote this subdivision. (*Id.* at p. 376.) However, as Client points out, *Maaso* did not discuss how this evidentiary restriction should affect the presentation of a request for section 998 costs to an arbitrator. Instead, the court simply concluded, “Maaso was not entitled to these costs and interest because he never requested these enhancements from the arbitrators. While Maaso put the panel on notice that a section 998 offer had been made, it is undisputed that he did not state the amount or seek to present evidence on the issue.” (*Maaso*, at p. 377.) Contrary to Attorney’s oral argument, *Maaso* did not attempt to prescribe how to present a section 998 request to an arbitrator.

The conundrum created by *Maaso* has been noted in Knight et al., Cal. Practice Guide: Alternative Dispute Resolution (The Rutter Group 2015). Paragraph 5:402.13 notes that a rejected offer is inadmissible in evidence. (*Id.* at p. 5-371.) Paragraph 5:402.14 states, based on *Maaso*, that “[t]he arbitrator must be informed, however, of the rejected CCP § 998 offer prior to making a final award in order to impose any applicable costs ‘penalties’ . . . .” (*Ibid.*) The comment in paragraph 5:402.15 observes: “The statute does not address how this is to be accomplished (the offer cannot be received in evidence). The issue is jurisdictional because once a final award is made, arbitrators have no power to make a ‘supplemental award’ on matters not covered by the original award [citation]. [¶] Therefore, arbitrators should determine before making a final award *whether* either party rejected a § 998 offer from the other (without considering who made the offer or the amount). If such an offer was made, at the conclusion of the evidentiary hearing, the arbitrator should expressly reserve jurisdiction to augment or withhold costs pursuant to CCP § 998, if applicable.”

(*Id.* at p. 5.372.) This comment appears to contemplate that arbitrators in every case will need to make a section 998 inquiry sua sponte, as the parties are precluded from introducing such evidence.

Unlike the Practice Guide, we believe there are solutions to this conundrum other than requiring all arbitrators to make sua sponte section 998 inquiries. In comparable circumstances, namely requests for contractual attorney fees and not section 998 costs, courts have recognized an arbitrator's authority to make supplemental awards, either by generally awarding attorney fees with the amount to be determined later in a supplemental award (*Britz, Inc. v. Alfa-Laval Food & Dairy Co.* (1995) 34 Cal.App.4th 1085, 1105-1106), or by awarding fees and reserving jurisdiction to calculate the amount (*Evans v. CenterStone Development Co.* (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 151, 159-160).

Some opinions have even concluded that arbitrators have implicit authority to correct their own oversights in failing to award requested fees. In *Century City Medical Plaza v. Sperling, Isaacs & Eisenberg* (2001) 86 Cal.App.4th 865 (*Century City Medical Plaza*), the arbitrator had "failed to rule on the expressly submitted issues of the appellant's claimed right to be awarded interest, costs and attorney fees as the successful party in the arbitration." (*Id.* at p. 867.) Relying on *A. M. Classic Const., Inc. v. Tri-Build Development Co.* (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 1470 (*A. M. Classic*), the court held that an arbitrator can correct his own error under the following circumstances: An arbitrator may employ a supplemental award to correct "a ruling on one or more submitted issues as to which the parties were entitled to a decision but which was omitted from the initial award through the arbitrator's mistake, inadvertence or excusable neglect . . . , *provided* such supplemental award (1) is requested and acted upon within the time allowed for the correction of an award by either statute or any controlling rules applicable to the arbitration, (2) is made prior to confirmation of the original award (so that they both may be considered for confirmation together as would have been the case but for the inadvertent omission), (3) is not inconsistent with other findings on the

merits of the controversy and (4) does not cause demonstrable prejudice to the legitimate interests of any party.” (*Century City Medical Plaza, supra*, at p. 881; fn. omitted.)<sup>17</sup> The time for an arbitrator’s correction of an award under section 1284 is “not later than 30 days after service of a signed copy of the award on the applicant.”

While the above authority is limited to correcting an arbitrator’s oversight, which is not our situation, it is still worthwhile to determine what these decisions consider to be the source of an arbitrator’s authority to correct his or her own oversights. *A. M. Classic, supra*, 70 Cal.App.4th 1470 noted that arbitrators have a limited authority to correct their awards under section 1284 of the CAA.<sup>18</sup> (*A. M. Classic*, at p. 1476.) The Second District Court of Appeal (Div. Six) observed that while section 1284 did not authorize correcting oversights, “[t]he absence of a statutory provision authorizing amendment of an award does not deprive the arbitrator of jurisdiction to do so. The parties concede that the arbitrator had authority to decide the entire dispute . . . .” (*A. M. Classic*, at p. 1476.) “In our view, the arbitrator was simply finishing his assignment by making a complete and full award on the matters submitted to him for resolution.” (*Ibid.*) “[I]t would be irrational to discard all the time and money spent by the parties where an arbitration award is inadvertently incomplete in one respect and where the oversight can be corrected without substantial prejudice to the legitimate interests

---

<sup>17</sup> We recognize there are limits to arbitrators correcting awards. (*Severtson v. Williams Construction Co.* (1985) 173 Cal.App.3d 86, 95-96 [unable to increase the amount of attorney fees and costs previously awarded]; *Cooper v. Lavelly & Singer Professional Corp.* (2014) 230 Cal.App.4th 1, 15 [unable to add previously denied attorney fees based on new evidence] (*Cooper*).

<sup>18</sup> Section 1284 provides in part, “The arbitrators, upon written application of a party to the arbitration, may correct the award upon any of the grounds set forth in subdivisions (a) and (c) of Section 1286.6 not later than 30 days after service of a signed copy of the award on the applicant.”



of a party.” (*Id.* at p. 1478.) *A. M. Classic* thus predicated the authority to self-correct on the arbitrator’s original authority to decide the entire dispute. The court did not discuss any particular rules of arbitration as conveying this authority.

In *Century City Medical Plaza, supra*, 86 Cal.App.4th 865, the Second District (Div. Three) followed the lead of *A. M. Classic*. The court first pointed out an arbitrator’s limited statutory authority to correct an award under section 1284. (*Century City Medical Plaza*, at pp. 877-878.) “[T]he power of an arbitrator to *correct* an award after it has been issued to the parties is limited to *evident* miscalculations of figures or descriptions of persons, things or property (§ 1286.6, subd. (a)) and *nonsubstantive* matters of form that do *not* affect the merits of the controversy. (§ 1286.6, subd. (c).)” (*Century City Medical Plaza*, at p. 877.)

The court then quoted the holding of *A. M. Classic* (*Century City Medical Plaza*, at p. 880) and adapted it as its own holding, adding the time restriction in section 1284 for self-correction. (*Id.* at p. 881.) Regarding the time restriction, the court noted: “This condition is not mentioned in *A. M. Classic*, but we believe it is necessarily required. A judicially endorsed right to modify or amend an award upon proof of an inadvertent omission should not enjoy more generous temporal restrictions than those provided for expressly authorized corrections or modifications under section 1284 (see fn. 17, *ante*) or applicable arbitration rules (see, e.g., AAA rule 48 [see fn. 9, *ante*]) in those cases where the parties have agreed to be bound by such rules.” (*Century City Medical Plaza*, at p. 881, fn. 25.) This quotation illustrates that these decisions derived an arbitrator’s power of self-correction from the arbitrator’s original authority to decide and not from any special authority conferred by statute (§ 1284) or the applicable arbitration rules.

Here we are not confronted with an arbitrator who inadvertently omitted deciding a presented issue. (*Cooper, supra*, 230 Cal.App.4th at p. 15.) Therefore, we consider the arbitrator’s authority under the applicable AAA’s Commercial Arbitration Rules and Mediation Procedures (“Comm. Arb. Rules”) effective on

October 1, 2013, after taking judicial notice of them as did the appellate court in *Century City Medical, supra*, 86 Cal.App.4th at p. 870. (Evid. Code, §§ 452, subs. (g) & (h), 455, subd. (a), and 459, subd. (c).)<sup>19</sup>

The parties agree that an AAA arbitrator has a limited authority to correct “clerical, typographical, or computational errors” in a final award. (Comm. Arb. Rules (2013) R-50.)<sup>20</sup> However, the parties also recognize that the Commercial Arbitration Rules empower an arbitrator to make “interim, interlocutory, or partial” awards “[i]n addition to a final award” in order to “assess and apportion the fees, expenses, and compensation related to such award . . . .”<sup>21</sup> (*Id.* at R-47, subd. (b).) We note that the rules authorize “an award of attorneys’ fees if all parties have requested such an award or it is authorized by law or their arbitration agreement.” (*Id.* at R-47, subd. (d) ii.) However the Commercial Arbitration Rules have no specific provision for awarding costs authorized by section 998. Any arbitral authority to award costs is presumably subsumed in the authority to

---

<sup>19</sup> We note that the arbitration rules noticed in *Century City Medical* were the “AAA’s ‘Commercial Dispute Resolution Procedures [ ] Amended and Effective on January 1, 1999 . . . .’ ” (*Century City Medical*, at p. 869, fn. 9.)

<sup>20</sup> Rule 50 (“R-50”) states in part: “Within 20 calendar days after the transmittal of an award, any party, upon notice to the other parties, may request the arbitrator, through the AAA, to correct any clerical, typographical, or computational errors in the award. The arbitrator is not empowered to redetermine the merits of any claim already decided.” (Comm. Arb. Rules, *supra*, R-50.) An introductory section entitled “Standard Arbitration Clause” states in part, “The services of the AAA are generally concluded with the transmittal of the award.”

The time for an arbitrator to make an award begins running when the hearing is closed. (*Id.* at R-39, subd. (c).) The hearing is closed when the arbitrator declares it closed. (*Id.* at R-39, subs. (a), (b).)

<sup>21</sup> Rule 47, subdivision (b) states: “In addition to a final award, the arbitrator may make other decisions, including interim, interlocutory, or partial rulings, orders, and awards. In any interim, interlocutory, or partial award, the arbitrator may assess and apportion the fees, expenses, and compensation related to such award as the arbitrator determines is appropriate.”

award expenses. It is up to the arbitrator to “interpret and apply these rules insofar as they relate to the arbitrator’s powers and duties.” (Comm. Arb. Rules, *supra*, R-8.)

We see no need to burden arbitrators with the obligation in every case to inquire whether a section 998 offer had been made and rejected. Rather, the burden should be placed on the party seeking the benefit of section 998 to request an award of its post-offer costs. Rather than requiring this party to violate section 998, subdivision (b)(2) by prematurely disclosing the existence of a rejected offer in arbitration proceedings, we believe a party’s section 998 request should be deferred until after the arbitration award is made. If and when a party makes a section 998 post-award request, an AAA arbitrator is empowered to recharacterize the existing award as interim, interlocutory, or partial and proceed to resolve the section 998 request by a subsequent award.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> While many appellate decisions have discussed interim arbitration awards without considering the authority to make them, *Hightower v. Superior Court* (2001) 86 Cal.App.4th 1415 did address the issue, concluding that an arbitrator was authorized to issue a partial final award giving one party an option to purchase shares of stock. (*Id.* at pp. 1426-1427.) The court identified two sources of this arbitral authority, the “Shareholders Agreement contain[ing] reciprocal buy-sell provisions giving each party an opportunity to buy the other out . . .” (*id.* at p. 1439) and a provision in AAA’s Commercial Arbitration Rules (effective July 1, 1996) that ““The arbitrator may grant *any remedy or relief that the arbitrator deems just and equitable* and within the scope of the agreement of the parties . . . .”” (*Id.* at pp. 1419, fn. 2, 1437-1438.) *Roehl v. Ritchie* (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 338 followed *Hightower* in upholding an arbitrator’s authority “to reserve jurisdiction to make incremental decisions.” (*Id.* at p. 351.)

Similarly in *Greenspan v. LADT, LLC* (2010) 185 Cal. App. 4th 1413, the Second District Court of Appeal (Div. One) stated at page 1455: “The arbitrator interpreted JAMS Rule 24 as a grant of authority to render successive awards, to request additional briefs and declarations on issues not resolved in the first award, and to establish a schedule to govern the supplemental briefing and the Final Award. Under JAMS Rule 11(a), the arbitrator’s interpretation and application of the Rules is final. We therefore defer to the arbitrator’s decision that the Rules

(Continued)

In this case the arbitrator's award described itself as "intended to be a complete disposition of all claims and counterclaims submitted to this Arbitration" and it should be regarded as a complete disposition of *submitted claims*. However, it must be acknowledged that Client was inhibited by statute from submitting his section 998 claim until after an award resolving the underlying dispute.<sup>23</sup> The delayed submission resulted from a statutory restriction and not Client's mistake or inadvertence. When Client properly tendered this separate issue after the arbitration award, the arbitrator should have exercised his authority to deem the existing award to be partial, interlocutory, or interim, rather than final, and should have addressed Client's section 998 claim for expenses on the merits, as strongly encouraged by the judicial policy favoring arbitral finality. We see nothing in the Commercial Arbitration Rules that prevented the arbitrator from reaching the merits of Client's section 998 request as it was appropriately presented after the award.

#### **D. REMEDIES FOR AN ARBITRATOR'S REFUSAL TO HEAR OR DECIDE AN ISSUE**

There are several statutory grounds for judicially correcting or vacating awards by arbitrators. Among the statutory grounds for vacating an arbitration award in section 1286.2, subdivision (a) are "(5) The rights of the party were substantially prejudiced . . . by the refusal of the arbitrators to hear evidence

---

permitted him to render the awards in the manner and on the dates he chose." In *Cooper, supra*, 230 Cal.App.4th 1, Division Four of the Second District distinguished *Greenspan (id. at p. 20)* and concluded that no JAMS Rule, including 24, expanded an arbitrator's power to correct an award beyond the restrictions stated in section 1284 and *Century City Medical*. (*Cooper*, at pp. 16-18.) As we are not considering JAMS arbitration rules, we need not resolve this conflict.

<sup>23</sup> Parties may stipulate to waive the restrictions of section 998, subdivision (b)(2), but that did not occur here.

material to the controversy or by other conduct of the arbitrators contrary to the provisions of this title.”

One basis for judicial intervention has been the failure to consider a submitted issue. As section 1283.4 requires an arbitral award to make “a determination of all the questions submitted to the arbitrators the decision of which is necessary in order to determine the controversy,” “[i]t has been held that where the record shows that an issue has been submitted to an arbitrator and that he totally failed to consider it, such failure may constitute ‘other conduct of the arbitrators contrary to the provisions of this title’ justifying vacation of the award . . . .” (*Rodrigues v. Keller* (1980) 113 Cal.App.3d 838, 841 (*Rodrigues*)).<sup>24</sup> The appellate court in *Rodrigues* rejected a claim “that any issue was submitted to the arbitrator which he totally failed to consider.” (*Id.* at p. 842.) But the failure to consider a submitted issue is a different ground for vacating an award than refusal to “hear” material evidence. *Gonzales v. Interinsurance Exchange* (1978) 84 Cal.App.3d 58 made this distinction. “First, we must determine whether alleging a failure to *consider* evidence is tantamount to alleging a refusal to *hear* evidence. [fn. omitted] We believe that it is not.” (*Id.* at p. 63.) “It is obvious from [the dictionary] definitions that the two words are not synonymous. One cannot ‘consider’ what one has refused to ‘hear.’ Legally speaking the admission of evidence is to hear it, and the weighing of it is to give it consideration.” (*Ibid.*) In that case there was no allegation of a refusal to hear.

In *Burlage v. Superior Court* (2009) 178 Cal.App.4th 524 (*Burlage*), the appellate court affirmed the trial court’s vacation of an award because the

---

<sup>24</sup> We note that of the six cases *Rodrigues* cited to support vacating an arbitration award due to an arbitrator’s failure to consider all issues, only two of them are direct authority, *Banks v. Milwaukee Ins. Co.* (1966) 247 Cal.App.2d 34, 39, and *M. B. Zaninovich, Inc. v. Teamster Farmworker Local Union 946* (1978) 86 Cal.App.3d 410, 415.

arbitrator had excluded material evidence. In an arbitration by a property buyer seeking damages from the seller for failing to disclose the property's boundaries, the arbitrator awarded the buyer damages for nondisclosure after excluding evidence that there had been an agreed lot line adjustment before the arbitration hearings were held. (*Id.* at pp. 527-528.) The appellate court asked, "What could be more material than evidence that the problem was 'fixed' and there are no damages?" (*Id.* at p. 530.) "The parties to an arbitration have bargained for a final and binding decision. (*Moncharsh v. Heily & Blase, supra*, 3 Cal.4th at p. 10.) But without the opportunity to present material evidence, Spencer did not receive the benefit of that bargain." (*Burlage*, at p. 531.)<sup>25</sup>

The facts before us reveal that the arbitrator refused to hear evidence of Client's section 998 settlement offer. This is not a case where Client has sought to reopen the arbitration hearings to present new evidence on a submitted issue. (Compare *Cooper, supra*, 230 Cal.App.4th at p. 20.) The section 998 issue had not been submitted before the award was made. Nor is this a case where Client submitted the issue to the arbitrator and presented evidence and now claims a legal error in the arbitrator's decision. The CAA does not allow courts to correct legal errors by arbitrators on submitted issues. An arbitrator's powers are not necessarily exceeded simply because the award contains a legal error. (*Moshonov, supra*, 22 Cal.4th at p. 779; *Moore, supra*, 22 Cal.4th at pp. 787-788.)

The companion cases of *Moshonov* and *Moore* both distinguished *DiMarco* rather than overruling it. *Moore* noted that neither case presented *DiMarco*'s issue whether "an arbitrator's refusal to award fees expressly mandated by the

---

<sup>25</sup> In the recent case of *Royal Alliance Associates, Inc. v. Liebhaber* (2016) 2 Cal.App.5th 1092, the appellate court concluded that arbitrators had failed to consider material evidence and upheld a trial court's vacation of an award. (*Id.* at pp. 1107-1108.)

underlying contract may be judicially corrected under section 1286.6.” (*Moore, supra*, 22 Cal.4th at p. 789.)

Here, we not only have an arbitrator’s refusal to award mandatory section 998 costs, but also a refusal even to hear evidence relevant to the section 998 offer and the issue of mandatory and discretionary costs under section 998. We have concluded above that his inaction was unjustified by the parties’ submissions and the applicable arbitration rules.

As the arbitrator did not decide Client’s section 998 request, the trial court might correct the award under section 1286.6, subdivision (b) “without affecting the merits of the decision upon the controversy submitted,” but only after finding an arbitral excess of power. In supplemental briefing, Client contends that the arbitrator exceeded his powers, but we need not reach that contention.

We recognize that a trial court is not authorized to vacate an award unless a party has filed a petition or response asking the court to either vacate or correct the award. (§ 1286.4.) Just as *Maaso* construed a petition to confirm an award as essentially a petition to vacate an award (*Maaso, supra*, 203 Cal.App.4th at p. 378), we construe Client’s combined motions to confirm the arbitration award and to make the section 998 award declined by the arbitrator as essentially a petition to correct or vacate the award. In supplemental briefing, Attorney contends that Client failed to present a basis for vacating or correcting the award. We disagree for the reasons stated above. We note that Attorney’s summary of section 1286.2, subdivision (a)(5) omits the relevant language about a refusal to hear material evidence.

We have concluded that the arbitrator should have reached the merits of Client’s post-award section 998 request by recharacterizing his final decision as an interim or partial final decision. We note that when a trial court vacates an arbitration award because the arbitrator refused to hear material evidence, the court’s power to remand the matter to the same arbitrator is limited. “If the award is vacated on the grounds set forth in paragraph (4) or (5) of subdivision (a) of

Section 1286.2, the court with the consent of the parties to the court proceeding may order a rehearing before the original arbitrators.” (§ 1287.) This restriction should not preclude Client from obtaining a decision on the merits of his section 998 request. If the parties in this case do not consent to a rehearing by the original arbitrator, the trial court is required under *Pilimai* to decide Client’s section 998 request.

#### **IV. DISPOSITION**

The orders confirming the arbitration award and denying Client’s request for section 998 costs are reversed. The court is directed to enter an order partially vacating the award and, with the parties’ consent, to order a hearing on Client’s request for section



998 costs before the same arbitrator so that the arbitrator may make an additional award. If the parties do not consent or the arbitrator again refuses to reach the merits of the section 998 request, the court shall hear and determine Client's request for section 998 costs. Client is entitled to costs on appeal.

---

WALSH, J. \*

WE CONCUR:

---

RUSHING, P.J.

---

PREMO, J.

---

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

Trial Court:

Santa Clara County Superior Court  
Superior Court No.: 112CV231939

Trial Judge:

The Honorable  
William J. Elfving

Attorneys for Appellant  
Shiraz M. Shivji:

Ellahie & Farooqui  
Javed I. Ellahie  
Omair Farooqui

Attorneys for Respondent  
Alan Heimlich:

Law Offices of Nicholas D. Heimlich  
Nicholas D. Heimlich

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Supreme Court of California

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Supreme Court of California

Case Name: **Alan Heimlich v. Shiraz Shivji**

Case Number: **TEMP-D14OYPZ8**

Lower Court Case Number:

1. At the time of service I was at least 18 years of age and not a party to this legal action.
2. My email address used to e-serve: **nickheimlich@nickheimlichlaw.com**
3. I served by email a copy of the following document(s) indicated below:

Title(s) of papers e-served:

Filing Type	Document Title
PETITION FOR REVIEW	H042641PRHEIMLICH

Service Recipients:

Person Served	Email Address	Type	Date / Time
Nick Heimlich Law Offices of Nicholas D. Heimlich 233232	nickheimlich@nickheimlichlaw.com	e-Service	07-10-2017 2:14:01 PM

This proof of service was automatically created, submitted and signed on my behalf through my agreements with TrueFiling and its contents are true to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

07-10-2017

Date

/s/Nick Heimlich

Signature

Heimlich, Nick (233232)

Last Name, First Name (PNum)

Law Offices of Nicholas D. Heimlich

Law Firm

