

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION FIVE

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN MATEO
COUNTY,

Respondent;

ELIZABETH SUE PETERSON, MARILY
CLARK, and MANJARI KANT,

Real Parties in Interest.

A160205

San Mateo No. 17-CIV-02669

BY THE COURT:*

The petition for writ of mandate/prohibition and accompanying stay request are denied.

Having carefully considered petitioner's arguments concerning the propriety of writ review under the circumstances of this case, the court declines to review the issues raised in the petition by extraordinary writ. The petition does not persuasively demonstrate that petitioner lacks other adequate remedies at law and that petitioner will suffer irreparable harm absent writ review. (*Hogya v. Superior Court* (1977) 75 Cal.App.3d 122, 128-132; *Omaha Indemnity Co. v. Superior Court* (1989) 209 Cal.App.3d 1266, 1269, 1271-1274; *Los Angeles Gay & Lesbian Center v. Superior Court* (2011) 194 Cal.App.4th 288, 299-300 ["Conditions prerequisite to the issuance of a writ are a showing there is no adequate remedy at law ... and the petitioner will suffer an irreparable injury if the writ is not granted. [Citation.]".])

In light of the foregoing, petitioner's motions for judicial notice and to permit lodging of exhibits conditionally under seal are denied as moot. The court clarifies that it has considered Exhibit F within the context of its

decision on the propriety of writ review. Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.46(d)(7), unless petitioner notifies the court within 10 days of the filing of this order that the exhibits subject to the sealing request are to be filed unsealed, the Clerk of Division Five shall permanently delete those electronically submitted exhibits.

Date: 6/2/2020 Jones, P.J., P.J.

* Before Jones, P.J., Needham, J. and Burns, J.