

California

Has the state allowed standing where federal court rejected?	If so, has the state court accepted or rejected principle articulated in <i>Spokeo</i> ?	Basis of Standing	Cite	Cause of Action	Holding
No	Acknowledged that California standing requirements overlap with Article III test for injury-in-fact and citing <i>Spokeo</i>	“Prudential considerations” as articulated by courts, which includes the requirement that the party be “beneficially interested” in a cause of action. <i>Coral Construction, Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco</i> , 116 Cal.App.4th 6 (2004)	<i>Limon v. Circle K Stores, Inc.</i> , 84 Cal.App.5th 671 (2022)	Violation of FCRA under 15 U.S.C. § 1681b	Plaintiff lacked standing because he failed to allege any concrete injury in connection with his claim of informational injury.

*Last updated 11/28/2022