

S198387  
**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA**  
En Banc

**SUPREME COURT  
FILED**

---

JULIE VANDERMOST, Petitioner,

v.

DEBRA BOWEN, as Secretary of State, etc., Respondent.

---

DEC 9 2011

Frederick K. Ohlrich Clerk  
Deputy

The order filed on December 9, 2011 is hereby corrected to read in its entirety (correcting erroneous year):

In light of the short time frame imposed by the impending 2012 electoral cycle, and the need to clarify the districts that are to be used in conducting the primary and general elections for the California Senate in 2012 should the referendum petitions that have been filed with the Secretary of State prove sufficient to qualify the referendum for placement on the November 2012 ballot and to stay the Senate redistricting map drawn and certified by the Citizens Redistricting Commission, the court has determined that it is appropriate to issue an order to show cause in this matter at this juncture, while reserving the question of this court's jurisdiction for resolution in our eventual decision in this proceeding.

In addition to addressing issues relating to what relief, if any, this court should order in the event the referendum regarding the Senate redistricting map qualifies for the November 2012 ballot, the parties are directed to address the following jurisdictional issues: (1) What standard or test should this court apply in determining whether a referendum is "likely to qualify" within the meaning of article XXI, section 3, subdivision (b)(2) of the California Constitution, for purposes of deciding when a petition for writ of mandate may be filed in this court under that constitutional provision? (2) Is this court's authority to entertain a petition for writ of mandate prior to the formal qualification of a referendum petition limited to the circumstances set forth in article XXI, section 3, subdivision (b)(2), or does this court have other authority (including inherent authority) to entertain such a petition even if it cannot yet be determined whether such a referendum is "likely to qualify" for placement on the ballot?

The motion of the Citizens Redistricting Commission to intervene in this proceeding and for leave to file preliminary opposition is granted.

To the extent the petition filed in this matter seeks any interim relief pending this court's eventual decision in this matter, the request for any such interim relief is denied.

Petitioner's request for judicial notice filed on December 2, 2011, is granted.

To facilitate this court's conducting of oral argument in this matter as early as the first two weeks in January 2012, and the filing of an opinion in this matter as early as the end of January 2012, the court orders an extremely expedited briefing schedule, as follows:

Respondent and intervener Citizens Redistricting Commission are each directed to serve and file a return or opposition to the order to show cause on or before Wednesday, December 14, 2011.

Petitioner may serve and file a reply to the return or opposition on or before Monday, December 19, 2011.

Any application to file an amicus curiae brief and any amicus curiae brief may be served and filed on or before Wednesday, December 21, 2011.

Any reply or consolidated reply to any amicus curiae brief or briefs may be served and filed on or before Thursday, December 22, 2011.

All service and filings may be made by facsimile with the original and hard copies to follow by mail. The court's fax number is (415) 865-7183.

No extension of time will be granted.

---

Cantil-Sakauye  
*Chief Justice*