

CASE NUMBER: 25STCV22384

Tentative ruling in department 71 on Apr. 27, 2026 in Los Angeles County, CA - Case no: 25STCV22384

Tentative Ruling prepared for:

Clayton Emmer

HEARING DATE

April 27th, 2026

COUNTY

Los Angeles County, CA

DEPARTMENT

71

DOCKET FILING DATE

July 30th, 2025

Tentative ruling in department 71 on Apr. 27, 2026 in Los Angeles County, CA - Case no: 25STCV2 2384

CASE NAME: [SUSAN LEA VS STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA, ET AL.](#)

CASE NO.: [25STCV22384](#)

On April 27, 2026, Los Angeles County Superior Court Department 71, issued the following tentative ruling.

The Reference Case No.: [25STCV22384](#) Los Angeles County, California. Hearing Date 04.27.2026.

View [Case Records](#) and [Case History](#).

Case Number: 25STCV22384 Hearing Date: April 27, 2026 Dept: 71 Superior Court of California

County of Los Angeles

DEPARTMENT 71

TENTATIVE RULING

SUSAN LEA,

vs.

STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA, et al.

Case No.:

25STCV22384

Hearing Date:

April 27, 2026

Pro Per Plaintiff Susan Leas motion for reconsideration of this Courts ruling on January 27, 2026, declaring Plaintiff a vexatious litigant is denied.

Plaintiff Susan Lea (Lea) (Plaintiff) moves in pro per for this Court to reconsider its ruling on January 27, 2026, declaring Plaintiff a vexatious litigant.

(Notice of Motion, pgs. 1-2; C.C.P. §1008(a).)

Background

On July 30, 2025, Plaintiff filed the instant lawsuit, alleging three causes of action against Defendants State Bar of California (State Bar); Brandon Stallings individually and in his capacity as Chair of the Board of Trustees of the State Bar (Stallings); Steven Moawad, individually and in his official capacity as Special Regulator of the State Bar (Moawad); and Leah Wilson (Wilson) (collectively, Defendants): (1) Violations of California Constitution, Art. I, §§1, 7, 9- Due Process; (2) Breach of Mandatory Duties; and (3) Negligence and Negligence Per Se.

On January 26, 2026, this Court heard argument on Defendants Motion to Declare Plaintiff a Vexatious Litigant and took the matter under submission.

On January 27, 2026, this Court granted Defendants Motion to declare Plaintiff a Vexatious Litigant under C.C.P. §391(b)(1) (1/27/26 Ruling). (1/27/26 Ruling on Submitted Matter.)

The Court also granted Defendants request that this Court enter a pre-filing order that requires Plaintiff to seek leave of the presiding judge before filing any new litigation in pro per.

(1/27/26 Ruling on Submitted Matter.)

On February 5, 2026, this Court set an Order to Show Cause Re: Why the Complaint Should not be Dismissed for Plaintiffs Failure to Post a Bond by April 1, 2026, scheduled for June 11, 2026.

Plaintiff filed the instant motion for reconsideration on February 6, 2026.

Defendants filed their opposition on April 14, 2026.

Plaintiff filed her reply on April 20, 2026.

Legal Standard

C.C.P. §1008(a) requires that a motion for reconsideration be based on new or different facts, circumstances, or law. A party seeking reconsideration also must provide a satisfactory explanation for the failure to produce the evidence at an earlier time.

(See C.C.P. §1008(a); *New York Times Co. v. Superior Court* (2005) 135 Cal.App.4th 206, 212.)

The moving party shall state by affidavit . . . what new or different facts, circumstances, or law are claimed to be shown.

(C.C.P. §1008(a).)

These requirements set forth the courts jurisdiction with regard to applications for reconsideration of its orders . . . (C.C.P. §1008(e).)

Otherwise, a court acts in excess of jurisdiction when it grants a motion to reconsider that is not based upon new or different facts, circumstances, or law.

(Id.)

Any party affected by the order may, within 10 days after service upon the party of written notice of entry of the order, file a motion for reconsideration.

(See C.C.P. §1008(a).)

Whether new facts alleged are sufficient to satisfy the requirements of CCP § 1008(b) is a question confided to the sound discretion of the trial court, with which the appellate court will not interfere absent an obvious showing of abuse. (*Graham v. Hansen* (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 965, 971.)

Discussion

Plaintiffs motion is denied.

First, Plaintiffs motion fails to make the required showing of new or different facts or circumstances as required by C.C.P. §1008(a) and, according to C.C.P. §1008(e), may not be considered.

According to the plain language of the statute, a court acts in excess of jurisdiction when it grants a motion to reconsider that is not based upon new or different facts, circumstances, or law.

(*Gilberd v. AC Transit* (1995) 32 Cal.App.4th 1494, 1500.) Plaintiffs motion is not supported by competent evidence.

To the extent Plaintiff argues wrongdoing or bias on the part of the Court in issuing its 1/27/26 Ruling, Plaintiff offers no tangible evidence to support her claims.

The evidentiary bar to substantiate such allegations is extremely high, as the law presumes that official duty has been regularly performed.

(Evid. Code §664.)

As an aspect of the presumption that judicial duty is properly performed . . . we presume . . . that the court knows and applies the correct statutory and case law [citation] and is able to distinguish admissible from inadmissible evidence, relevant from irrelevant facts, and to recognize those facts which properly may be considered in the judicial decision-making process.

(*In re Marriage of Davenport* (2011) 194 Cal.App.4th 1507, 1526 [quoting *People v. Coddington* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 529, 644, overruled on other grounds in

Price v. Superior Court (2001) 25 Cal.4th 1046].) The only way to overcome this presumption is by an affirmative showing of error in the record.

(*People v. Shiga* (2016) 6 Cal.App.5th 22, 40.) Plaintiff fails to present any evidence in the record that the Court engaged in wrongdoing or was biased at the hearing (on the Motion to Declare Plaintiff a Vexatious Litigant).

Moreover, Plaintiffs motion lacks an attached affidavit, which is required, stating what new or different facts, circumstances, or law are claimed to be shown.

(C.C.P. §1008(a).)

Accordingly, Plaintiffs motion is denied.

Conclusion

Plaintiffs motion for reconsideration is denied.

Moving Party to give notice.

Dated:

April ____, 2026

Hon. Daniel M. Crowley

Judge of the Superior Court