NEW CASE REPORT

Name of Case (full name):	Maryanne G. Gilliard, Individually and On Behalf of a Class of Similarly Situated Persons v. California Department of Human Resources, Eraina Ortega, in her official capacity as the Director of the California Department of Human Resources, Malla Cohen, in her official capacity as the Controller of the State of California, California Public Employees' Retirement System, the Board of Administration of California Public Employees' Retirement System, in its official capacity as Administrator of the Judges' Retirement System and the Judges' Retirement System II, the Judges' Retirement System II, and Does 1 through 100, Inclusive
Date Received By Legal Office:	September 5, 2024
Attorney Contact(s):	Austa Wakily (CalPERS Counsel) Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General (Outside Counsel)
Program Contact(s):	LEGO
Plaintiff(s):	Maryanne G. Gilliard
Defendant(s):	Individuals and entities named as defendants in the case's caption.

Issues/Status: shall be increased by multiplying their current salary by the average percentage increase for CA state employees in the current fiscal year. Gilliard seeks a declaration that CalHR must include all categories of salary increases in	Other Parties:	None
	Issues/Status:	Sacramento Superior Court Judge Maryanne Gilliard, who claims that the State is underpaying its judges. Specifically, she claims that the method CalHR uses to calculate judges' salaries violates Gov. Code section 68203(a), which states that the salary of each judge shall be increased by multiplying their current salary by the average percentage increase for CA state employees in the current fiscal year. Gilliard seeks a declaration that CalHR must include all categories of salary increases in calculating the average percentage salary increase. She also seeks back pay and benefits, retroactively to 2016. Her suit
Potential Monetary Impact: Unknown at this time.	Potential Monetary Impact:	Unknown at this time

NEW CASE REPORT

Name of Case (full name):	California Statewide Law Enforcement Association and Michael Mattson v. California Public Employees' Retirement System and Does 1 to 20	
Date Received By Legal Office:	September 16, 2024	
Attorney Contact(s):	Lisa Hammond (CalPERS Counsel) Elizabeth Yelland (CalPERS Counsel)	

Program Contact(s):	LEGO
Plaintiff(s):	California Statewide Law Enforcement Association; Michael Mattson
Defendant(s):	California Public Employees' Retirement System
Other Parties:	None
Issues/Status:	This writ of mandate was filed by the California Statewide Law Enforcement Association (CSLEA), asserting that the Dept. of Justice peace officers should be included in the statutory definition of "police" for retirement purposes, and thus be able to benefit from the special rules for "qualified participants" under IRC section 415(b).
Potential Monetary Impact:	Unknown at this time.