



# NEWS RELEASE

Release Number: 29

Release Date: March 30, 2006

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF  
CALIFORNIA  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE  
OF THE COURTS  
Public Information Office  
455 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688  
[www.courtinfo.ca.gov](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov)

415-865-7740

Lynn Holton  
Public Information Officer

## Supreme Court Approves Live Broadcast of Oral Arguments in Los Angeles

### *California Channel to Offer Satellite Coverage of Three Cases*

San Francisco—As part of its continuing effort to improve public understanding of the state courts, the California Supreme Court has approved a live television broadcast of oral argument in the first three cases on its calendar on Tuesday, April 4, 2006. The session will be held from 9 a.m. to 12 noon in the Supreme Court Courtroom, Ronald Reagan State Office Building, 210 South Spring Street, Los Angeles.

The cases to be televised involve various legal issues, including liability related to sexually transmitted diseases; the priority of state timber laws over county regulations; and the propriety of a police “car stop” based on an anonymous tip concerning suspected drunk driving.

It is the third time this year that the Supreme Court has approved a live broadcast by California Channel, a public affairs cable network with 5.6 million viewers statewide (<http://www.calchannel.com>). The network will offer satellite coverage for other networks and TV stations. The oral arguments also will be audiocast live on the California Courts Web site at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courts/supreme/>.

The cases to be televised include the following legal issues, among others:

- **9 a.m.—*John B. v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County, S128248.*** Under California law, may a person be held liable for failure to disclose to a sexual partner the fact that the person has a sexually transmissible disease only when the person *actually knows* he or she has a sexually transmissible disease or also when the person *reasonably should have known* he or she has such a disease?
- **10 a.m.—*Big Creek Lumber Co. v. County of Santa Cruz, S123659.*** Do state timber laws preempt all county regulation of

timber harvesting, including the designation of zoning districts where harvesting can take place and the permissible location of helicopter operations related to timber harvesting?

- **11 a.m.—*People v. Wells (Susan)*, S128640.** Does an anonymous tip that a driver of a motor vehicle appears to be driving under the influence afford reasonable suspicion to support a police officer's stopping of the vehicle, where the information given by the anonymous informant cannot be corroborated except as to facts (for example, the description of the vehicle at the designated location) that do not themselves point to any criminal activity?

The California Supreme Court is the highest court in California, and its decisions are binding on all other state courts. The court holds oral argument throughout the year in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Sacramento. Once a year, the court also holds oral argument in an additional location as part its annual court-community outreach program.

For more information on the court, please visit the Supreme Court's Web site at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courts/supreme/> . The court's Practices and Procedures Handbook is available online at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courts/supreme/iopp.htm> .

Following is the court's entire oral argument calendar for April 2006:

**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR  
LOS ANGELES SESSION  
APRIL 4 and 5, 2006**

**(FIRST AMENDED)**

**TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 2006—9:00 A.M.**

***(1) John B. v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (Bridget B., Real Party in Interest), S128248***

#04-126 John B. v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (Bridget B., Real Party in Interest), S128248. (B169563; 121 Cal.App.4th 1000; Superior Court of Los Angeles County; BC271134.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal granted in part and denied in part a petition for peremptory writ of mandate. The court limited review to the following issues: (1) Under California law, may a person be held liable for failure to disclose to a sexual partner the fact that the person has a sexually transmissible disease only when the person *actually knows* he or she has a sexually transmissible disease (see *Doe v.*

*Roe* (1990) 218 Cal.App.3d 1538) or also when the person *reasonably should have known* he or she has such a disease? (2) If the duty to disclose is limited to situations in which a person actually knows he or she has a sexually transmissible disease, did the discovery permitted by the Court of Appeal in the present case violate either traditional standards of discovery (e.g., relevance) or constitutionally protected rights of privacy?

**(2) *Big Creek Lumber Co. v. County of Santa Cruz, S123659***

#04-54 *Big Creek Lumber Co. v. County of Santa Cruz, S123659*. (H023778; 115 Cal.App.4th 952; Superior Court of Santa Cruz County; CV134816, CV137992.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Do the state timber laws (Gov. Code, § 51100 et seq. [California Timberland Productivity Act of 1982]; Pub. Resources Code, § 4511 et seq. [Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act of 1973]) preempt all county regulation of timber harvesting, including the designation of zoning districts where harvesting can take place and the permissible location of helicopter operations related to timber harvesting?

**(3) *People v. Wells (Susan) (Baxter, J., not participating; Croskey, J., assigned justice pro tempore), S128640***

#04-150 *People v. Wells (Susan), S128640*. (F043125; 122 Cal.App.4th 155; Superior Court of Kern County; BF101553A.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issue: Does an anonymous tip that a driver of a motor vehicle appears to be driving under the influence afford reasonable suspicion to support a police officer's stopping of the vehicle, where the information given by the anonymous informant cannot be corroborated except as to facts (e.g., the description of the vehicle at the designated location) that do not themselves point to any criminal activity?

**1:30 P.M.**

**(4) *People v. Hudson (Gregory), S122816***

#04-43 *People v. Hudson (Gregory), S122816*. (B162812; unpublished opinion; Superior Court of Los Angeles County; BA226321.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court limited review to the following issues: (1) What circumstances properly should be considered in determining whether a peace officer's motor vehicle is "distinctively marked" within the meaning of section 2800.1(a)(3) of the Vehicle Code? (2) Does the trial court have a sua sponte duty to instruct the jury regarding the meaning of the term "distinctively marked" as used in that section, and if so, how should that term be defined?

**(5) *Ordlock v. Franchise Tax Board, S127649***

#04-136 *Ordlock v. Franchise Tax Board, S127649*. (B169465; 120 Cal.App.4th 1366; Superior Court of Los Angeles County; BC278386.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case includes the following issue:

Does the four-year statute of limitations for issuing a notice of a proposed deficiency assessment (Rev. & Tax. Code, § 19057) preclude the Franchise Tax Board from imposing a deficiency assessment upon a taxpayer after the four-year period when the deficiency assessment is based upon a change in the taxpayer's federal tax liability for the relevant tax year and the taxpayer failed to notify the Franchise Tax Board of the change? (See Rev. & Tax. Code, §§ 18622, 19059, 19060.)

**(6) *People v. Gonzalez (Jose) [Automatic Appeal], S072946***

This matter is an automatic appeal from a judgment of death.

**WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 2006—9:00 A.M.**

**(7) *Carter v. California Department of Veterans Affairs, S127921***

#04-133 *Carter v. California Department of Veterans Affairs, S127921*. (E030908; 121 Cal.App.4th 840; Superior Court of San Bernardino County; BCV03693.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case includes the following issues: (1) Prior to its amendment by Statutes 2003, chapter 671, did the Fair Employment and Housing Act (Gov. Code, § 12900 et seq.) impose a duty on an employer to take reasonable steps to prevent hostile environment sexual harassment of an employee *by a client* with whom the employee is required to interact? (2) If not, did the Legislature intend the 2003 amendment to apply retroactively to incidents that occurred prior to the effective date of the amendment? (3) If so, would application of the 2003 amendment to such cases violate the due process clause of the state or federal Constitution?

**(8) *People v. Brendlin (Bruce), S123133***

#04-31 *People v. Brendlin (Bruce), S123133*. (C040754; 115 Cal.App.4th 206; Superior Court of Sutter County; CRF012703.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense.

**(9) *People v. Saunders (Devance), S122744***

#04-32 *People v. Saunders (Devance), S122744*. (H025674; unpublished opinion; Superior Court of Santa Clara County; CC246493.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses.

*Brendlin* and *Saunders* include one or more of the following issues: (1) When a car is subjected to a traffic stop, is a passenger in the car “seized” or “detained” within the meaning of the Fourth Amendment, so that the passenger may challenge the validity of the traffic stop in contesting the admissibility of evidence obtained from the passenger after the stop? (2) May a car that has expired registration tags but that also has a temporary registration permit be legally stopped to investigate the validity of the temporary permit? (3) Can a parolee subject to a search condition challenge his detention as invalid if police were not aware he was on parole at the time they detained him?

**2:00 P.M.**

***(10) Estate of Saueressig (Timothy), S129110***

#04-149 Estate of Saueressig (Timothy), S129110. (B167907; 122 Cal.App.4th 1086; Superior Court of Los Angeles County; BP 076076.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Can the statutory requirement that a will be signed by at least two qualified witnesses (Prob. Code, § 6110) be satisfied where an otherwise qualified witness does not sign the will until after the testator's death?

***(11) People v. Cole (Pearle Vision), S121724 (Werdegar J., not participating; Ikola, J., assigned justice pro tempore)***

#04-15 People v. Cole (Pearle Vision), S121724. (D040475; 113 Cal.App.4th 956; Superior Court of San Diego County; GIC783135.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part an order issuing a preliminary injunction in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: Does the Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act of 1975 (Health & Saf. Code, § 1340 et seq.) exempt approved providers under the act from the limitations that Business and Professions Code sections 665 and 2556 otherwise impose on business and financial relationships between dispensing opticians and optometrists or ophthalmologists?

***(12) People v. Johnson (Jay), S127602 (to be called and continued to the early May 2006 calendar)***

#05-212 People v. Johnson (Jay), S127602. (A085450; unpublished opinion; Superior Court of Contra Costa County; 96-0691-4.) On remand from the United States Supreme Court in *Johnson v. California*, No. 04-6964. This case presents the following issue: What is the appropriate remedy for *Wheeler/Batson* error (*People v. Wheeler* (1978) 22 Cal.3d 258; *Batson v. Kentucky* (1986) 476 U.S. 79) in this case—outright reversal of defendant's conviction or a limited remand to permit the trial court to inquire into the prosecutor's reasons for removing minority jurors?

#