

1 Cody Jay Brownstein
1117 City Lights Dr
2 Aliso Viejo CA 92656
Phone: 310-874-8743
3 Email: me@brownstein.co

4 Defendant in pro per
5
6
7

8 **Superior Court of the State of California**
9 **County of Orange – Central Justice Center**
10

11 People of the State of California,
12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 Cody Jay Brownstein,
15 Defendant.
16
17

Case No. 30-2024-01403673-CU-JR-CJC

**Memorandum of Points and
Authorities in Reply to Plaintiff's
Opposition to Defendant's
Demurrer**

Hearing date and time:
August 2, 2024 / 8:30 a.m.

Department: C65

18
19 **I. Introduction**
20

21 First, Defendant urges the Court to exercise its discretion to refuse to
22 consider Plaintiff's late-filed opposition, which possibly was never validly served.

23 Second, if the Court is convinced that a demurrer is impermissible in this
24 action, Defendant urges the Court to consider his demurrer instead as a motion for
25 judgment as a matter of law under the Court's inherent power. Note that in
26 Defendant's notice of demurrer, he expressly states: "Alternatively, Defendant
27 will, and by this notice does, move the Court to exercise its inherent power to enter
28 judgment for Defendant as a matter of law." (Demurrer 2.)

1 Third, Defendant urges the Court to deny any request by Plaintiff for a
2 continuance of the hearing.

3 4 **II. Argument**

5 6 **A. The Court Should Exercise Its Discretion to Refuse to Consider** 7 **Plaintiff's Late-Filed (and Possibly Never-Served) Opposition.**

8 Under Code of Civil Procedure section 1005(b), oppositions are to be filed
9 at least 9 court days before the hearing. [Code Civ. Proc. § 1005\(b\)](#). *See also* [Cal.](#)
10 [R. Ct. 3.1320\(c\)](#). 9 court days before the hearing on Defendant's demurrer was
11 July 22, 2024, over a week ago.

12 The Court can exercise discretion to refuse to consider Plaintiff's
13 (extremely) late-filed opposition. *See* [Cal. R. Ct. 3.1300\(d\)](#). Plaintiff didn't file its
14 opposition until July 30, 2024, or 3 days before the hearing on Defendant's
15 demurrer.

16 Although Defendant was provided a copy of Plaintiff's opposition by email,
17 Defendant never consented to electronic service. *See* [Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6\(c\)](#)
18 [\(2\)-\(3\)](#). As far as Defendant is aware, Plaintiff's opposition was never validly
19 served. (Plaintiff didn't provide Defendant with a proof of service.) If Plaintiff's
20 opposition wasn't validly served, the Court should refuse to consider the
21 opposition on this additional ground.

22 **B. The Court Should Alternatively Consider Defendant's Demurrer** 23 **as a Motion for Judgment As a Matter of Law Under the Court's** 24 **Inherent Power.**

25 As pointed out in the introduction to this reply memorandum, Defendant
26 gave notice that in the alternative, he's asking the Court to exercise its inherent
27 power to treat his demurrer as a motion for judgment as a matter of law. In its
28 opposition, Plaintiff doesn't address this at all.

1 In Defendant's demurrer, he cites to Cottle v. Super. Ct., 3 Cal. App. 4th
2 1367 (1992). In that case, the Court of Appeals held that courts have broad and
3 inherent powers to control litigation. Cottle, 3 Cal. App. 4th at 1376-78. The Court
4 is also likely aware that in criminal actions, nonstatutory motions to dismiss are
5 recognized as appropriate to present issues of a constitutional nature. *See, e.g.,*
6 People v. Duncan, 78 Cal. App. 4th 765, 772, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 173, 177-78 (2000).
7 (Defendant is aware the present action is a civil action.) Plaintiff can't seriously
8 argue that it's prejudiced by knowing Defendant's arguments and the authorities
9 he's relying on a month before the hearing.

10 **C. The Court Shouldn't Continue the Hearing on Defendant's**
11 **Demurrer Since Plaintiff Intentionally Didn't Address the Merits.**

12 There's no reason the Court should continue the hearing on Defendant's
13 demurrer for any length of time. Defendant informed Plaintiff way back in June
14 that he planned on filing a demurrer. (Demurrer 7, ¶ 4.) Defendant timely served
15 his demurrer on July 3, 2024. (Demurrer, Proof of Service.) Plaintiff provides no
16 reason for waiting until 3 days before the hearing on Defendant's demurrer to file
17 an opposition that doesn't address the merits of Defendant's demurrer. Plaintiff
18 doesn't even even allude to how it would "address the demurrer on its merits
19 through supplemental briefing." (Opposition 2.)

20
21 **III. Conclusion**
22

23 In summary: (1) Plaintiff's opposition shouldn't be considered given that it
24 was filed late, only 3 days before the hearing on Defendant's demurrer, and the
25 opposition seemingly wasn't even validly served; (2) Defendant's demurrer can be
26 treated as a motion for judgment under the Court's inherent powers, a point
27 Plaintiff doesn't address in its opposition; and (3) Plaintiff's request for a
28

1 continuance should be denied, given that it's solely Plaintiff's fault that it doesn't
2 address Defendant's demurrer on the merits.

3
4 Dated: July 30, 2024

5
6 *C. Brownstein*

7 _____
8 Cody Jay Brownstein,
9 Defendant in pro per
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Akram Musleh, am over the age of 18 years and am not a party to this cause. My business address is 12405 Venice Boulevard #403, Los Angeles, California 90066.

On July 30, 2024, I served the parties listed below with the documents listed below by enclosing and sealing a copy of the documents in a separate envelope for each party, postage fully prepaid, then depositing the envelopes in a mailbox regularly maintained by the United States Postal Service at Aliso Viejo, California.

Documents:

Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Demurrer

Parties:

Ray Gennawey, Deputy District Attorney Todd Spitzer, District Attorney County of Orange, State of California PO Box 808 Santa Ana CA 92702	Attorneys for Plaintiff, People of the State of California
--	---

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

Dated: July 30, 2024

/s/ _____
Akram Musleh