

Shepard's® Signal indicators and treatments



Valuable tools help you reach a decision point quickly and easily

Rely on *Shepard's*[®] Citations Service for critical information that could either support or negatively affect your case. Validate your citing references quickly and efficiently, and be confident the cases and statutes you want to cite are still good law.

Only Shepard's® Citations Service includes positive treatments

With comprehensive editorial analysis, you can easily identify not only negative treatments, but also neutral and exclusive positive treatments. This approach helps identify splits in authority and can lead to additional support for your case.

Gain insight at a glance

Shepard's Signal™ indicators help you produce high-quality work in less time. Using these visual representations, you can assess the impact of treatments of your case. *Shepard's* Signal indicators are integrated into case-law documents and provide an immediate indication of subsequent history and treatment of a particular case. (See list with visuals on page 2.)

Use *Shepard's* Signal indicators to quickly focus on pertinent sources, access information you might not otherwise notice and determine what's most important to you—including both neutral and positive analysis needed to identify splits in authority.

Understand the status of your case over time

Shepard's analysis phrases are indicators of the status of your law over time. They are assessed by attorney-editors according to strict standards and guidelines, and each phrase is assigned a *Shepard's* Signal indicator. This shortcut helps you reach a decision point quickly and easily.

| | SHEPARD'S SIGNAL INDICATORS | COMMON ANALYSIS PHRASES |
|----|--|---|
| \$ | Positive treatment indicated The green signal indicates that citing references in the <i>Shepard's</i> Citations Service contain history or treatment that has a positive impact on your case (for example, affirmed or followed by). | Followed by —The citing opinion relies on the case you are <i>Shepardizing</i> [™] as controlling or persuasive authority. |
| 1 | Warning: Negative treatment is indicated for statute The red exclamation point signal indicates that citing references in the <i>Shepard's</i> Citations Service contain strong negative treatment of the <i>Shepardized</i> [™] section (for example, the section may have been found to be unconstitutional or void). | Unconstitutional by—The citing case declares unconstitutional the statute, rule or regulation you are <i>Shepardizing</i>. Void or invalid by—The citing case declares void or invalid the statute, rule, regulation or order you are <i>Shepardizing</i> because it conflicts with an authority that takes priority. |
| • | Warning: Negative treatment is indicated The red signal indicates that citing references in the <i>Shepard's</i> Citations Service contain strong negative history or treatment of your case (for example, overruled by or reversed). | Overruled by—The citing case expressly overrules or disapproves all or part of the case you are <i>Shepardizing</i>. Abrogated by—The citing case effectively, but not explicitly, overrules or departs from the case you are <i>Shepardizing</i>. Superseded by—The citing reference—typically a session law, other record of legislative action or a record of administrative action—supersedes the statute, regulation or order you are <i>Shepardizing</i>. |
| Q | Questioned: Validity questioned by citing references The orange signal indicates that the citing references in the Shepard's Citations Service contain treatment that questions the continuing validity or precedential value of your case. | Questioned by —The citing opinion questions the continuing validity or precedential value of the case you are <i>Shepardizing</i> because of intervening circumstances, including judicial or legislative overruling. |
| | Caution: Possible negative treatment indicated The yellow signal indicates that citing references in the <i>Shepard's</i> Citations Service contain history or treatment that may have a significant negative impact on your case (for example, limited or criticized by). | Criticized by—The citing opinion disagrees with the reasoning/result of the case you are <i>Shepardizing</i>, although the citing court may not have the authority to materially affect its precedential value. Distinguished by—The citing case differs from the case you are <i>Shepardizing</i>, either involving dissimilar facts or requiring a different application of the law. |
| A | Neutral: Citing references with analysis available The blue "A" signal indicates that citing references in the <i>Shepard's</i> Citations Service contain treatment of your case that is neither positive nor negative (for example, explained by). | Explained by—The citing opinion interprets or clarifies the case you are <i>Shepardizing</i> in a significant way. Cited in Dissenting Opinion at—A dissenting opinion cites the case you are <i>Shepardizing</i>. Interpreted or construed by—The citing opinion interprets the statute, rule or regulation you are <i>Shepardizing</i> in some significant way, often including a discussion of the statute's legislative history. |
| 0 | Cited by: Citation information available The blue "I" signal indicates that citing references are available in the <i>Shepard's</i> Citations Service for your case, but the references do not have history or treatment analysis (for example, the references are law review citations). | Cited by —The citing document references the <i>Shepardized</i> cite. |

How to Shepardize a case and use Shepard's Signal indicators.

First, when you are looking at a case you can detect possible issues using the Shepard's Preview before you Shepardize.



Shepard's Preview

After you Shepardize, you'll see a full Shepard's report with details on each citing decision.

| Agendame Hestory Accellage Sectors Comp Occounts Comp Occo | III 🜔 Lexis Enter a | ource name, a citation, terms, or shep: [citation]to Shepardize ® Everything > Q Client:-None- | History Help M |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Appendix Holdy Append | hepard's®: 🔺 <u>Peatros v.</u> | Bank of America, 22 Cal. 4th 147 Parallel Citations > | |
| A Carp Decisions One Cating Decisions One Cating Sources Table of Automates Tarrow By A Cathor Sources Tarrow Tarrow Tarrow Tarr | Appellete Liletany | Citing Decisions (64) | |
| Other Cating Sources Image: Cating Sources Sort by: Court Highest: Adaysis aakon Court Highest: Sort by: Court Highest: Adaysis aakon Prac. Dec. (CCH) P44749 Difference Court Difference Court Highest: Concerd by The court Highest: Image: Highest | | | |
| Table of Authorities harrow By Analysis Aution Checking Aution Part Dec. (Cick) P4479 Image: Pa | | | |
| arrow By Analysis Analysis Analysis Analysis Casedon Construction Casedon Constru | Other Citing Sources | Related Court Materials | |
| Analysis An | Table of Authorities | | |
| Calcolar Prac. Dec. (CCH) P44749 Discussion Prace Dec. (CCH) P44749 Prace Dec. (CCH) P44749 Discussion Prace Dec. (CCH) P44749 Discussion Discussion Pace Dec. (CCH) P44749 | Varrow By | | Court (highest-lowest) |
| Prac. Dec. (CCH) P44749 Prac. Dec. (CCH) P44749 | Analysis | | |
| Concert Prac. Dec. (CCH) P44749 Discussion Prac. Dec. (CCH) P44749 Image: Concert of the construction of the constr | Caution | 1. Harris v. City of Santa Monica, 56 Cal. 4th 203, 152 Cal. Rptr. 3d 392, 294 P.3d 49, 2013 Cal. L | EXIS 941, 96 Emp |
| Datapulated by Tastive Tast | | Prac. Dec. (CCH) P44749 📥 | |
| Positive dy several s | children of | | 20 C |
| Follows by = | | Cited by 56 Cal 4th 203 p 234 152 Cal Botr 3d 392 p 413 294 P 3d 49 p 67 | Discussion |
| extral extral employee proves it would have find the employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. Goe not and have find any employee anyway for lawful measure. (8) Hands Tab VII. (8) Hands Tab VIII. (8) Hands Tab VIII. (8) Hands Tab VIII. (8) Hands | | under the FEHA-indeed, compensation for such distress would be a windfall to the employee-if the | Court |
| Continue State Courts Minute Assessment Continue State Courts State Courts <td></td> <td>employer proves it would have fired the employee anyway for lawful reasons. (18) Harris contends that we</td> <td></td> | | employer proves it would have fired the employee anyway for lawful reasons. (18) Harris contends that we | |
| Clade in Dissenting Option at 1 2 Clade in Dissenting Option at 1 2 Explained by 1 3 Clade in Dissenting Option at 1 3 Explained by 1 4 Clade by 1 4 Court 4 Action Apartment Assn., Inc. v. City of Santa Monica, 41 Cal. 4th 1232, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 398, 163 P.3d 89, 90 Court 4 Action Apartment Assn., Inc. v. City of Santa Monica, 41 Cal. 4th 1232, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 398, 163 P.3d 89, 90 Court 4 Action Apartment Assn., Inc. v. City of Santa Monica, 41 Cal. 4th 1232, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 398, 163 P.3d 89, 90 Sectoruit 5 Sectoruit 5 Sectoruit 6 Sectoruit 7 Sectoruit <td>re del al</td> <td>snould not limit noneconomic damages remedies because the FEHA, unlike Title VII, does not and has not historically placed limitations on damages remedies. (See Peatros y Bank of America /2000) 22 Cel 4th 147</td> <td></td> | re del al | snould not limit noneconomic damages remedies because the FEHA, unlike Title VII, does not and has not historically placed limitations on damages remedies. (See Peatros y Bank of America /2000) 22 Cel 4th 147 | |
| Cate in Dissenting Opinion at 1 Image: Cate in Dissentin Dissentin Dissenting Opinion at 1 Ima | | 163 , 166-167 [91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 659 , 990 P.2d 539] .) But the fact that | |
| Explained by 1 Cited by* 43 P Check by* 43 P Check by* 43 P Check by* 44 P Check by* 44 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 P Check by* 1 | | | Headnotes |
| Beleer multiple 0 2. Action Apartment Assn., Inc. v. City of Santa Monica, 41 Cal. 4th 1232, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 398, 163 P3d 89, 160 P3d 473, 160 P3d | | | HNZ7 I HNZ9 |
| Beleer multiple 0 2. Action Apartment Assn., Inc. v. City of Santa Monica, 41 Cal. 4th 1232, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 398, 163 P3d 89, 160 P3d 473, 160 P3d | 'Cited by" 4 | | |
| eideral Courts Image: Courts | Select multiple | | 53 P.3d 89, 2007 C |
| Select Clouds 10 Select Clouds 5 Select Clouds 5 Card Circuit 5 Select Clouds 5 Card Circuit 5 Select Clouds 5 Card Circuit 6 Select Clouds 5 Select Clouds 2 Select Clouds 6 Select Clouds 7 Se | Court | A second se | Discussion |
| 9eh Circuit 5 9eh Circuit 5 2nd Circuit 2 2nd Circuit 2 2nd Circuit 2 3eh Circuit 2 3ehet 2007 State Courts 40 Calibraina 38 Guam 1 Select multiple 2 2 3. Viva! Internat. Voice for Animals v. Adidas Promotional Retail Operations, Inc., 41 Cal. 4th 929, 63 Cal. Rpt. 162 P.3d 569, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 7855 (1 Count 2 3 Circed by: 41 Cal. 4th 929, 936 83 Cal. Rpt. 3d 50 p.53 182 P.3d 589 p.571 9 F.53 422 j. 3 T[the categories of preemption are not 'igidy' distord opn. of Mosk, J.1) We and the Under States Superne Court have often identified only three sepaces of preemption , grouping contice 2 10 Soussed 4 4 Cacho v. Boudreau, 40 Cal. 4th 341, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 43 p.50 149 P.3d 473, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 541, 2007 </td <td></td> <td>Cited by: 41 Cal. 4th 1232 p.1243 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 398 p.407 163 P.3d 89 p.96</td> <td>and the place shall</td> | | Cited by: 41 Cal. 4th 1232 p.1243 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 398 p.407 163 P.3d 89 p.96 | and the place shall |
| 2nd Oravit 2 2nd Oravit 2 <td></td> <td> A local ordinance is preempted by a state statute only to the extent that the two conflict. (Cohen v. Board of Supervisors (1995) 40 Col 24 277, 204 [219 Col. Potr 467, 707 B 24 940] (Cohen V. con also Postton v. Post</td> <td></td> | | A local ordinance is preempted by a state statute only to the extent that the two conflict. (Cohen v. Board of Supervisors (1995) 40 Col 24 277, 204 [219 Col. Potr 467, 707 B 24 940] (Cohen V. con also Postton v. Post | |
| 24d Circuit 4 3d Circuit 4 3d Circuit 1 Select multiple 1 State Courts 40 California 36 Guam 1 Select multiple 1 State Courts 40 California 36 Guam 1 Select multiple 1 State Courts 1 Select multiple 1 Select multiple 1 Claudit (2000) 22 Circla LEXIS 7855 (2007 Cal. LEXIS 785 (2007 Cal. Cal. Martine (2007 22 Cal. LeXIS 785 (2007 | | | |
| and chain and chain and chain and chain and chain Belicitie and chain and chain and chain and chain Belicitie and chain and chain and chain and chain State Courts and and chain and chain and chain and chain Galiomia and and chain and chain <td< td=""><td></td><td>that the litigation privilege is inimical to and thus preempts (1) the provision of section 4.56.020(i)(1) authorizing a</td><td></td></td<> | | that the litigation privilege is inimical to and thus preempts (1) the provision of section 4.56.020(i)(1) authorizing a | |
| and unlaw HN4 Select multiple Image: Select multiple State Courts Calibornia Galdornia 102 P.3d 569, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 7855 • Guam 112 P.3d 569, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 7855 • Guam 112 P.3d 569, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 7855 • Select multiple Image: Cited by: 41 Cal. 4th 829 p.936 63 Cal. Rpt: 3d 50 p.53 162 P.3d 569 p.571 Belect multiple Image: Cited by: 41 Cal. 4th 829 p.936 63 Cal. Rpt: 2d 55, 900 P23 201 (lead op. or 10 Mosk. J.). J. We and the United States Supreme Court have often identified only three species of preemption. grouping conflict Discussion Image: Cited by: 41 Cal. 4th 321 p.332 Cal. Rpt: 2d 53, 900 P23 201 (lead op. or 10 Mosk. J.). J. We and the United States Supreme Court have often identified only three species of preemption. grouping conflict Discussion Image: Cited by: 40 Cal. 4th 341, 53 Cal. Rpt: 3d 43, 149 P.3d 473, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 217, 2007 Cal. Dail Discussion Image: Cited by: 40 Cal. 4th 341, 53 Cal. Rpt: 3d 43 p.50 149 P.3d 473, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 217, 2007 Cal. Dail Discussion Image: Cited by: 40 Cal. 4th 341, 53 Cal. Rpt: 3d 43 p.50 149 P.3d 473, p.479 Discussion Image: Cited by: 40 Cal. 4th 341, 53 Cal. Rpt: 3d 43 p.50 149 P.3d 473, p.479 Discussion Image: Cited by: 40 Cal. 4th 341, 53 Cal. Rpt: 3d 43 p.50 149 P.3d 473, p.479 Discussion Image: Cited by: 40 Cal. 4th 341 p.352 Cal. | | suit based on a defendant | |
| State Courts 40 Calitomia 35 Guam 1 South Daktada 1 Select multi | 8th Circuit | | |
| Calibria 35 Guam 1 South Dakota 1 </td <td>Select multiple</td> <td></td> <td></td> | Select multiple | | |
| Guam 1 Sourd Dakota 1 | State Courts 4 | 3. Viva! Internat. Voice for Animals v. Adidas Promotional Retail Operations, Inc., 41 Cal. 4th 92 | 9, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d |
| South Dakota 1 Select multiple - 0 F 30 4 22 () 3 T[The categories of preemption are not 'igid] direction are not 'igid] direc | California 38 | 162 P.3d 569, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 7855 🚸 | |
| South Dakota 1 Ciped by: 41 Cal. 4m 20 p.936 83 Cal. Rptr: 3d 50 p.531 C2 P36 (2 Kol 2000) Ciped by: 41 Cal. 4m 20 p.936 83 Cal. Rptr: 3d 50 p.531 C2 P38 (2 Kol 2000) Council (2000) 330 U.S. 383, 372, fn. 61 (47 L Ed. 2d 352, 120 S, Cl 288) (accord, Paetros v. Bank of America (2000) 22 Cal. Link 112, 153, Kol 11 El Cal. Rptr: 2d 559, 900 P2 2d 359 (1 kocord, Paetros v. Bank of America (2000) 22 Cal. Link 112, 153, Kol 11 El Cal. Rptr: 3d 43, 149 P.3d 473, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 217, 2007 Cal. Daits 2007 Date 2007 Image: South Dakoned 5 Image: South Paetros v. Bank of America (2000) 22 Cal. America (2000) 22 Cal. South P3. Sout | Guam | | Discussion |
| Belect multiple Our t Council (2000) 530 U.2 Cal.4th 147, 153, fn, 11 GP Cal. Rptr. 2d 559, 990 P.2d 3391 (lead op. of Mosk, J.3), We and the Unide States Buyerne Court have often identified only three species of preemption, grouping conflict Marcica (2000) 22 Cal.4th 147, 153, fn, 11 GP Cal. Rptr. 2d 559, 990 P.2d 3391 (lead op. of Mosk, J.3), We and the Unide States Buyerne Court have often identified only three species of preemption, grouping conflict Marcined 5 Cal. Marcined 5 Caled 33 Geted multiple Headnotes Cited by: 40 Cal. 4th 341, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 43, 149 P.3d 473, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 217, 2007 Cal. Dai Service 379, 2007 D.A.R. 517 United general rules of attabutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implication" are general rules of attabutory interpretation "amendments by implication" are general rules of attabutory interpretation "amendments by implication" are general rules of attabutory interpretation specific attabutory rovisions. (See Pestroe v. Bank of America (2000) 22 Cal.4th 147, 167–168 (91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 659, 900 P.2d Sal 91 Sector Within Results Cited by: 40 Cal. 4th 935 p.80 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 43 p.50 149 P.3d 473 p.479 unider general rules of attabutory interpretation "amendments by implication" are general rules of attabutory interpretation "amendments by implication" are general rules of attabutory interpretation "amendments by implication" are general rules of attabutory interpretation "amendments by implication" are general rules of attabutory interpretation "amendments by implication" are general rules of attabutory interpretation "amendments by implication" are general rules of attabutory interpretation are rules of attabutory rules pestro verules of attabutory interpr | South Dakota | Cited by: 41 Cal. 4th 929 p.935 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 50 p.53 182 P.3d 589 p.571 | Discussion |
| Council (2000) 330 U.S. 303, 372, th. 6 [147 L. Ed. 2d 32, 720 S. 6 (288]; accord, Pestros v. Bank of Analyzed Analyzed Analyze | | | Court |
| Discussion and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. grouping conflict and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. grouping conflict and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. grouping conflict and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. grouping conflict and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. grouping conflict and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. grouping conflict and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. grouping conflict and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. grouping conflict and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. grouping conflict and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. grouping conflict and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. grouping conflict and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. Headnotes and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of preemption. and the United State's Bugerine Court have often identified only three species of another rational way to harmonice the status of the measure's other another identified only three species of another rational way to harmonice the species often identified only three species often identified only three species often identified with the prete | Select multiple | Council (2000) 530 U.S. 363 , 372 , fn. 6 [147 L. Ed. 2d 352 , 120 S. Ct. 2288] ; accord, Pestros v. Bank of | |
| Analyzed & Analyzed & Preemption and obstacle preemption 2007 Analyzed & Mentoned 5 Cited 33 Belect multiple I Cated 33 Belect multiple I Cated 5 Cited 5 Discussed I Cated 5 Discusse | Discussion | and the United States Supreme Court have often identified only three species of preemption, grouping conflict | |
| Discussed 4 Mentioned 5 Cited 33 Belect multiple Headnotes Cited 5: 4 Cacho v. Boudreau, 40 Cal. 4th 341, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 43, 149 P.3d 473, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 217, 2007 Cal. Dai Service 379, 2007 D.A.R. 517 Cited 5: 40 Cal. 4th 341, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 43 p.50 149 P.3d 473, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 217, 2007 Cal. Dai Service 379, 2007 D.A.R. 517 Cited 5: 40 Cal. 4th 341 p.332 S3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 43 p.50 149 P.3d 473, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 217, 2007 Cal. Dai Service 379, 2007 D.A.R. 517 Court under general uses of statutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implication" and "exceptions by implication" and "exceptions (See Peetra voice v Bank of America (2000) 22 Cal.14th 147, 167–168 105 101 Cal. Rptr. 2659, 900 P.26 Signature of Mosk, J.); Lesher Communications, Inc. v. City of Walnut Creek (1990) 52 Cal.3d 531, 540– Set of Walnin Results Cited 5y: 36 Cal. 4th 935 p.900 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 685 p.705 111 P.3d 954, 2005 Cal. LEXIS 5610, 2005 Op. Service 4325, 2005 D.A.R. 5965 Set of Wathin Results Voltionally separable if it is not necessary to the measure's endement. When state law conflicts web (fieldal law. "It is control careament of when on the act of another when state law conflicts web (fieldal law. "It is not necessary to the measure's endement. When state law conflicts web (fieldal law. "It is not necessary to the measure's endement. When state law conflicts web (fieldal law. "It is not necessary to the measure's endement. When state law conflicts web (fieldal law. "It is entrol careament of other the tratest of the measure's endement. (2000) 2 | | | |
| | | | |
| Cited 33 Select multiple • 4. Cacho v. Boudreau, 40 Cal. 4th 341, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 43, 149 P.3d 473, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 217, 2007 Cal. Dail Select multiple • Headnotes • Use text of headnotes • N4 33 • N6 15 • N28 14 • N28 14 • Select multiple • Search Wthin Results • Gited by: 40 Cal. 4th 941 p.352 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 43 p.50 149 P.3d 473 p.479 • Use text of headnotes • N4 33 • Search Wthin Results • Gited by: 50 Cal. 4th 941 p.352 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 43 p.50 149 P.3d 473 p.479 • Use text of headnotes • N4 53 • Search Wthin Results • Search Wthin Results • Other with the searce of another ational way to harmonic the statutory provisions. (See Petros v. Bank of America (2000) 22 Cal.4th 147, 167–168 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 659, 900 P.2d 530 3 [plur, opt. of hiose, J.], Lesher Communications, inc. v. City of Wainut Greek (1990) 52 Cal.3d 531, 540–530 3 [plur, opt. of hiose, J.], Lesher Communications, inc. v. City of Wainut Greek (1990) 52 Cal.3d 531, 540–530 3 [plur, opt. of hiose, J.], Lesher Communications, inc. v. City of Wainut Greek (1990) 52 Cal.3d 531, 540–530 3 [plur, opt. of hiose, J.], Lesher Communications, inc. v. City of Wainut Greek (1990) 52 Cal.3d 531, 540–530 3 [plur, opt. of hiose, J.], Lesher Communications, inc. v. City of Wainut Greek (1990) 52 Cal.3d 531, 540–530 3 [plur, opt. of hiose, J.], Lesher Communications, inc. v. City of Wainut Greek (1990) 52 Cal.2d 541, 551, 2007 • More • Search Wthin Results • Otherwise is an individual of the searce of the measure's other motion of the measure's other motion of the individual of the measure's other motion of the individual of the searce of the measure's other measure's | | 5 | 1000 |
| Select multiple Headnotes Kew text of headnotes Mew text of headn | | E 4. Carbox Boudreau 40 Cal 4th 341 53 Cal Patr 3d 43 140 Pad 473 2007 Cal LEVIS 247 24 | 007 Cal Daily On |
| + Headnotes - Headnotes - Headnotes - Ideadboxes - Neadnotes - We text of headnotes - Neadnotes | | | JU/ Cal. Dally Op. |
| i under general jules of statutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implications of an device general jules of statutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implications of an device general jules of statutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implications of an device general jules of statutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implications of an device general jules of statutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implications of an device general jules of statutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implications of an device general jules of statutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implications of an device general jules of statutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implications of an device general jules of statutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implications of an device general jules of statutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implications of an device general jules of statutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implications of an device general jules of statutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implications of an device general jules of statutory interpretation "amendments by implications of an device general jules of an device jules of an device general jules of an device jules of an device general jules of an device jules of an device general jules of an device jules of a | Headnotes | Cited by: 40 Cal. 4th 341 p.352 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 43 p.50 149 P.3d 473 p.479 | Discussion |
| ANA 33 provisions. (See Pestros v. Bank of America (2000) 22 Cal.4th 147, 167–168 (91 Cal. Rptr. 24 659, 990 P.24 5393 [plur. gpn. of Moscimumications. Inc. v. City of Wainut Creek (1990) 52 Cal.3d 531, 540– 541 [277 Cal. Rptr. 1, 802 P.2d 317]: Date 2007 N2S 14 N2P 15 Jenter 2007 Set (127 Cal. Rptr. 1, 802 P.2d 317] : N2P 14 N2P 15 Jenter 2007 Set (127 Cal. Rptr. 1, 802 P.2d 317] : N2P 14 N2P 15 Jenter 2007 Set (127 Cal. Rptr. 1, 802 P.2d 317] : N2P 16 Set (127 Cal. Rptr. 1, 802 P.2d 317) : Set (127 Cal. Rptr. 3d 685, p.705 111 P.3d 954, 2005 Cal. LEXIS 5610, 200 | | under general rules of statutory interpretation "amendments by implication" and "exceptions by implication" are | Court |
| with and the set of the set | | generally distavored and are accepted only in the absence of another rational way to harmonize the statutory provisions (See Peatros y Bank of America (2000) 22 Cel 4th 147 167-168 [91 Cel Botr 24 659 990 P24 | |
| | | 539] (plur. opn. of Mosk , J.); Lesher Communications, Inc. v. City of Walnut Creek (1990) 52 Cal.3d 531 , 540- | |
| h22 14 h27 13 e More 0 elect multiple Image: Cled by: 35 Cal. 4th 935; 28 Cal. Rptr: 3d 685; 111 P.3d 954; 2005 Cal. LEXIS 5610; 2005 e Sarch Within Results Cled by: 35 Cal. 4th 935; 980 28 Cal. Rptr: 3d 685; p.705 111 P.3d 954; 9.071 e Sarch Within Results Cled by: 35 Cal. 4th 935; 980 28 Cal. Rptr: 3d 685; p.705 111 P.3d 954; 9.071 constraints, It is Transformation of the measure's operation and purposes. It is conservation of the measure's operation and purposes. It is conservation of the measure's operation and purposes. It is contracted by: a bank of America (2000) 29 conservation and purposes. It is mont of contract in the strets and the interface (1 Pash of America (2000) 20 | | 541 [277 Gal. Rptr. 1 , 802 P.2d 317] ; | 2007 |
| N27 13 S. Jevne v. Superior Court, 35 Cal. 4th 935, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 685, 111 P.3d 954, 2005 Cal. LEXIS 5610, 2005 Op. Service 4325, 2005 D.A.R. 5965 Description Court, 35 Cal. 4th 935 p.960 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 685 p.705 111 P.3d 954 p.871 Search Within Results Court and, hence, can be removed as a whole without affecting the wording of any of the measure's other provisionally separable if it is not necessary to the measure's other voltionally separable if it is not not critical importance to the measure's color cal. Date whot hat fear law confiles Date whot hat call any control on the critical in the crites and the influe of 2000 29 | | | |
| N27 13 Op. Service 4325, 2005 D.A.R. 5965 • Discussion # More indext multiple Indext multiple Indext multiple • Search Within Results Indext multiple Indext multiple • Search Within Results Indext multiple Indext multiple | | 5. Jevne v. Superior Court, 35 Cal. 4th 935, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 685, 111 P.3d 954, 2005 Cal. LEXIS 5 | 56 1 0, 2005 Cal. Da |
| More More Delect multiple Search Within Results Voltionally separable if it is not necessary to the measure's operation and purpose, it is Voltionally separable in its not necessary to the measure's notifies voltionally separable in the acted and not intrins' (Peartore y Rank of America (2000) 2 Date | 100 | | |
| Search Within Results Search Within | More | | |
| Search Within Results "separate" and, hence, can be removed as a whole without affecting the wording of any of the measure's other provisions. It is "functionally" separate if it is not necessary to the measure's operation and purpose. It is "voltionally" separate in the state and on the chart and on the state and on the chart of and the state and on the state of and the state and on the state | Select multiple | Cited by: 35 Cel 4th 935 n 980 28 Cel Botr 3d 885 n 705 111 P3d 954 n 971 | Discussion |
| Search Within Results provisions. It is "functionally" separable if it is not necessary to the measure's operation and purpose. It is Volitionally separable if it was not of critical importance to the measure's encoment. When state law conflicts with facture law "this resemented notive the strate and in critical." (Pactrox # Rank of America (2000) 2 Date | | "separate" and, hence, can be removed as a whole without affecting the wording of any of the measure's other | Court |
| with faderal law "it is preempted only to that extent and no further" (Peatros y Bank of America (2000) 22 Date | Search Within Results | provisions. It is "functionally" separable if it is not necessary to the measure's operation and purpose. It is | |
| | Enter court laure | | |
| Cal.4th 147, 158 [91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 659, 990 P.2d 539] 2005 | enter sedren terms | | 2005 |
| | | | Headnotes |

You can easily view explanations of the Shepard's Signal indicators.

Click any *Shepard's* Signal (e.g., distinguished by, questioned by) to view its short definition.

View a full list of definitions, if desired, by clicking the **Legend** button.

You will then see the legend, which scrolls to list all *Shepard's* Signal indicators, along with treatment icons and analysis definitions.

× Distinguished by Cou The citing case differs from the case you are Shepardizing[™], a vie either involving dissimilar facts or requiring a different dl incl application of the law. thre io Shepard's Signal[™] indicator: A Caution: Possible negative 22 of T treatment is indicated nd thre ot tot All Shepard's® editorial phrases just FEHA and other state law causes of action" (Peatros, 22 Cal.4th at p. 189



| Legend | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Shepard's Signal [™] indicator | Analysis | | ^ | | | | |
| Warning: Negative treatment is indicated. | Red | Warning | | | | | |
| The red Shepard's Signal™ indicator indicates that citing references in the Shepard's⊚ Citations Service contain strong negative history or treatment of your case (for example, overruled by or | Orange | Questioned | | | | | |
| reversed). | Yellow | Caution | | | | | |
| () Warning | Green | Positive | | | | | |
| The red Shepard's Signal™ indicator indicates that citing references in the Shepard's® Citations Service contain strong negative treatment of the section (for example, the section may have been | Blue | Neutral | | | | | |
| found to be unconstitutional or void). | Light Blue | No phrase exists | | | | | |
| Q Questioned: Validity questioned by citing reference. | | | | | | | |
| The orange Shepard's Signal [™] indicator indicates that the citing references in the Shepard's® Citations Service contain treatment that questions the continuing validity or precedential value of your case because of intervening circumstances, including judicial or legislative overruling | Depth of Discussion Analyzed | | | | | | |
| Caution: Possible negative treatment indicated | Discusse | d | | | | | |
| The yellow Shepard's Signal™ indicator indicates that citing references in the Shepard's® Citations Service contain history or treatment that may have a significant negative impact on your case (for | Mentione | d | | | | | |
| example, limited or criticized by). | Cited | | ~ | | | | |
| Refer to the Help section for more information | | | | | | | |

FOR MORE INFORMATION VISIT LEXISNEXIS.COM/SHEPARDS, CONTACT YOUR LEXISNEXIS® REPRESENTATIVE OR CALL 888.253.3901



LexisNexis, Lexis, Shepard's, Shepardized and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks and Shepard's Signal, Shepardized and Shepardizing are trademarks of RELX Inc. Other products or services may be trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective companies. ©2020 LexisNexis BMH00200-4 0920