

1 **GROTEFELD HOFFMANN**

2 Jordan B. Everakes (SBN 251371)
3 5535 Balboa Boulevard, Suite 219
4 Encino, CA 91316
(747) 233-7150

JEverakes@ghlaw-llp.com

5 **SCHROEDER LOSCOTOFF STEVENS
6 LLP**

7 Amanda R. Stevens (SBN 252350)
8 502 Mace Blvd., Suite 11
9 Davis, CA 95618
10 Phone: (916) 438-8300

astevens@calsubro.com

11 **Liaison Counsel for Subrogation Plaintiffs**

12 **BARON & BUDD, P.C.**

13 John P. Fiske (SBN 249256)
14 Victoria E. Sherlin (SBN 312337)
15 11440 West Bernardo Court, Suite 265
16 San Diego, CA 92127
17 Phone: (858) 251 -7424

fiske@baronbudd.com

tsherlin@baronbudd.com

18 **Liaison Counsel for Public Entity Plaintiffs**

19 **SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON
20 COMPANY**

21 Belynda B. Reck, State Bar No. 163561
22 belynda.reck@sce.com
23 Patricia A. Cirucci., State Bar No. 210574
24 patricia.cirucci@sce.com
25 Brian Cardoza, State Bar No. 137415
26 brian.cardoza@sce.com
27 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
28 Rosemead, CA 91770
Telephone: (626) 302-6628

**Attorneys for Defendants Southern
California Edison Company and Edison
International**

COZEN O'CONNOR

Howard D. Maycon (SBN 183766)
601 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 3700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Phone: (213) 892-7900

hmaycon@cozen.com

**BAUMAN LOEWE WITT & MAXWELL,
PLLC**

Matthew E. Delinko (SBN 302832)
8765 E Bell Road, Suite 210
Scottsdale, AZ 85260
Phone: (480) 502-4664

mdelinko@blwmlawfirm.com

DIAB CHAMBERS LLP

Ed Diab (SBN 262319)
Kristen Barton (SBN 303228)
10089 Willow Creek Road, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92131
Phone: (619) 658-7010

ed@dcfirm.com

kbarton@dcfirm.com

FROST LLP

Justin M. Goldstein, State Bar No. 198858
justin@frostllp.com
Louise Nutt, State Bar No. 273130
lnutt@frostllp.com
10960 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90024
Telephone: (424) 254-0441
Facsimile: (424) 600-8504

1 The Parties in the above captioned action jointly file this [Proposed] Case Management Order No.
2 11 for the Court’s consideration.

- 3 • Language in blue is added by Defendants and reflects Defendants position.

4 **I. GENERAL PROVISIONS**

5 Nothing in this order is intended to or does supersede any prior Case Management Order in this
6 matter, unless otherwise noted. (See Case Management Order No. 1 dated March 17, 2025 (“CMO 1”),
7 Case Management Order dated April 18, 2025 (“CMO 2”), Case Management Orders dated May 15, 2025
8 (“CMO 3” and “CMO 4”), and Case Management Order Dated June 2, 2025 (“CMO 5”), Case
9 Management Order Dated July 10, 2025 (“CMO 6”), Case Management Order Dated August 19, 2025
10 (“CMO 7”), Case Management Order Dated September 19, 2025 (“CMO 8”), Case Management Order
11 Dated October 6, 2025 (“CMO 9”), Case Management Order Dated December 18, 2025 (“CMO 10”).

12 **II. CROSS-COMPLAINTS**

13 The time for Cross-Defendants County of Los Angeles, Consolidated Fire Protection District of
14 Los Angeles County (“Los Angeles County Fire Department”), Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department, Office
15 of Emergency Management, Genasys, Inc., City of Pasadena, Pasadena Water and Power, City of Sierra
16 Madre, Kinneloa Irrigation District, Rubio Cañon Land & Water Association, Las Flores Water Company,
17 Lincoln Avenue Water Company, and Southern California Gas Company to respond to Defendants’ cross-
18 complaints is stayed until after the February 25, 2026, Case Management Conference, where issues related
19 to the cross-claims will be discussed, including timelines for responsive motions or pleadings.¹ Counsel
20 for Defendants shall give notice to Cross-Defendants that they are ordered to appear at the February 25,
21 2026, Case Management Conference.

22 **III. PROPOSED PREFERENCE PLAINTIFFS**

23 CMO 9 states that “Any Proposed Preference Plaintiff who wishes to be considered for
24 inclusion in the initial bellwether trial must have their case filed and related to the Lead Case no later
25 than October 31, 2025, with exceptions made for good cause as determined by the Court.” For the
26 handful of Proposed Preference Plaintiffs who seek such a good cause exception to the CMO 9 deadline
27 shall, by February 15, 2026, provide to counsel for Defendants, Michael Schneider at
28

¹ It is Defendants’ position that Cross-Defendants must participate in any trial that occurs.

1 mschneider@houston.com, with copy to Liaison Counsel for Individual Plaintiffs, Amanda Riddle at
2 alr@coreylaw.com, a declaration supporting the reason for the good cause exception. Counsel for
3 Defendants shall respond within five (5) business days stating whether they will stipulate to the request
4 for a good cause exception. If counsel for Defendant does not so stipulate, the matter will be addressed
5 at the next Case Management Conference.

6 CMO 9 also details the deadlines for any Proposed Plaintiff to sit for their deposition. Any
7 Proposed Preference Plaintiff who cannot competently sit for a deposition by the deadlines prescribed in
8 CMO 9, shall provide to counsel for Defendants, Michael Schneider at mschneider@houston.com, with
9 copy to Liaison Counsel for Individual Plaintiffs, Amanda Riddle at alr@coreylaw.com, a declaration
10 supporting the reason for the good cause exception, including identification of reasons why the Proposed
11 Preference Plaintiff cannot competently sit for a deposition by the respective CMO 9 deadline. Counsel
12 for Defendants shall respond within five (5) business days stating whether they will stipulate to the request
13 for a good cause exception.² If counsel for Defendant does not so stipulate, the matter will be addressed
14 at the next Case Management Conference.

15 Any Proposed Preference Plaintiff who identifies that they cannot competently sit for deposition
16 by the respective CMO 9 deadline, shall waive their ability to testify at trial. Defendants reserve all rights
17 to contest whether a Proposed Preference Plaintiff can competently sit for a deposition and to testify at
18 trial. Counsel for the respective Individual Plaintiffs who identify that they cannot competently sit for
19 deposition shall also consider whether that plaintiff needs a guardian ad litem to act for them in the
20 litigation and whether a family member can testify at deposition to their experience and shall meet and
21 confer with Defendants on this issue as to specific plaintiffs.

22 **IV. BELLWETHER SELECTION ELIGIBILITY**

23 Per the Court's August 19, 2025 Minute Order, the first bellwether trial in this matter is set for
24 January 25, 2027. To be eligible for inclusion in the pool for selection for the first bellwether trial,
25 Proposed Preference Plaintiffs must meet the requirements of CMO 9, as modified by § III, above. Any
26 other Individual Plaintiff who seeks to be included in the pool for selection for the first bellwether trial,
27

28 _____
² For avoidance of doubt, any stipulation regarding the good cause exception shall not waive Defendants' ability to later
contest whether a Proposed Preference Plaintiff can competently sit for a deposition, and shall only concern whether an
Individual Plaintiff remains eligible to qualify as a Proposed Preference Plaintiff in the initial bellwether trial.

1 must, no later than March 16, 2026: (1) File and have their case related to the Lead Case; (2) Complete
2 and serve their Plaintiff Fact Sheet; (3) Complete and serve their Liability Questionnaire; and (4) Complete
3 and serve their Damages Questionnaire and Document Checklist.

4 Prior to the February 25, 2026, Case Management Conference, the Parties shall meet and confer
5 as to a process for selection of Individual Plaintiff households to be included in the January 25, 2027,
6 bellwether trial.

7 **V. GUARDIAN AD LITEMS**

8 Prior to contacting the judicial clerk regarding the status of a guardian ad litem application,
9 counsel shall first review the Special Master's respective recommendation report, which can be obtained
10 from the Special Master's case manager, Erin Zicari (ezicari@signatureresolution.com), or found on
11 Case Anywhere, to confirm the recommendation.

12 **VI. PRO HAC VICE APPLICATIONS**

13 Attorneys who are in good standing and licensed to practice law outside of California but who do
14 not have an active California license may submit pro hac vice applications for multiple cases at one time
15 but must submit a pro hac vice application for each case on which they seek to be admitted. As such, if
16 the Court grants one pro hac vice application and the same counsel files additional cases, a subsequent pro
17 hac vice application must then be filed for the additional cases. Any such applications shall be filed in the
18 *Gursey* case and shall apply to each case listed in the application. The cases must be listed in a vertical
19 list, not in paragraph form, and shall include the name of the lead plaintiff and the case number, e.g.:

- 20 • *Plaintiff First Name Plaintiff Last Name, et al. v. Defendants, Case No. 25STCV00000*
- 21 • *Plaintiff First Name Plaintiff Last Name, et al. v. Defendants, Case No. 25STCV00001*
- 22 • *Plaintiff First Name Plaintiff Last Name, et al. v. Defendants, Case No. 25STCV00002*

23 Counsel should ensure payment of the renewal fee at least five (5) days prior to the one year
24 anniversary of the entry of the related order, otherwise the order will automatically terminate.
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 02/06/2026, 2026



Laura Seigle

Hon. Laura A. Seigle
Judge of the Superior Court
Laura A. Seigle / Judge