



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR  
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION  
MARCH 4, 2014**

The following cases are placed upon the calendar of the Supreme Court for hearing at its courtroom in the Ronald M. George State Office Complex, Earl Warren Building, 350 McAllister Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California, on March 4, 2014.

**TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2014—9:00 A.M.**

- |     |         |  |
|-----|---------|--|
| (1) | S200872 | Long Beach Police Officers Association v. City of Long Beach et al. (Los Angeles Times Communications LLC, Real Party in Interest) |
| (2) | S200923 | Duran (Sam) et al. v. U.S. Bank National Association   |
| (3) | S207165 | In re D. B.; People v. D. B.   |

**1:30 P.M.**

- |     |         |  |
|-----|---------|--|
| (4) | S202724 | People v. Chiu (Bobby)   |
| (5) | S188238 | People v. Elmore (Charles)                                       |
| (6) | S065575 | In re Champion (Steve Allen) on Habeas Corpus [Automatic Appeal] |

---

CANTIL-SAKAUYE  
*Chief Justice*

If exhibits are to be transmitted to this court, counsel must apply to the court for permission. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.224(c).)

**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR  
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION  
MARCH 4, 2014**

The following case summaries are issued to inform the public about cases that the California Supreme Court has scheduled for oral argument and of their general subject matter. In most instances, the descriptions set out below are reproduced from the original news release issued when review in each of these matters was granted and are provided for the convenience of the public. The descriptions do not necessarily reflect the view of the court or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.

**TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2014—9:00 A.M.**

**(1) *Long Beach Police Officers Association v. City of Long Beach et al. (Los Angeles Times Communications LLC, Real Party in Interest), S200872***

#12-41 Long Beach Police Officers Association v. City of Long Beach et al. (Los Angeles Times Communications LLC, Real Party in Interest), S200872. (B231245; 203 Cal.App.4th 292; Superior Court of Los Angeles County; NC055491.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a request for a preliminary injunction. This case presents the following issue: Are the names of police officers involved in on-duty shooting incidents subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act?

**(2) *Duran (Sam) et al. v. U.S. Bank National Association, S200923***

#12-52 Duran (Sam) et al. v. U.S. Bank National Association, S200923. (A125557, A126827; 203 Cal.App.4th 212; Superior Court of Alameda County; 2001035537.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents issues concerning the certification of class actions in wage and hour misclassification litigation and the use of representative testimony and statistical evidence at trial of such a class action.

**(3) *In re D. B.; People v. D. B., S207165***

#13-24 *In re D. B.; People v. D. B., S207165.* (C067353; 210 Cal.App.4th 1035; Superior Court of Sacramento County; JV125361.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order in a juvenile wardship proceeding. This case presents the following issue: Does Welfare and Institutions Code section 733, subdivision (c), preclude committing a juvenile ward to the Division of Juvenile Justice if the wardship petition includes both qualifying and non-qualifying offenses and the most recent offense is a non-qualifying one?

**1:30 P.M.**

**(4) *People v. Chiu (Bobby), S202724***

#12-90 *People v. Chiu (Bobby), S202724.* (C063913; nonpublished opinion; Superior Court of Sacramento County; 03F08566.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. This case presents the following issue: Does a conviction for first degree murder as an aider and abettor under the natural and probable consequences doctrine require that premeditated murder was a reasonably foreseeable consequence of the target crimes or only that murder was such a consequence?

**(5) *People v. Elmore (Charles), S188238***

#11-11 *People v. Elmore (Charles), S188238.* (B216917; nonpublished opinion; Superior Court of Los Angeles County; TA090607.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. This case presents the following issue: Does the doctrine of imperfect self-defense apply when the defendant's actual, but unreasonable, belief in the need to defend himself was based solely on a psychotic delusion?

**(6) *In re Champion (Steve Allen) on Habeas Corpus, S065575* [Automatic Appeal]**

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