



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR  
SAN FRANCISCO SESSION  
MAY 1, 2018  
FIRST AMENDED**

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 May 1, 2018.

**TUESDAY, MAY 1, 2018 — 9:00 A.M.**

- (1) Troester (Douglas) v. Starbucks Corporation, S234969  
(*Grimes, J., assigned justice pro tempore*)
- (2) Jameson (Barry S.) v. Desta (Taddese), S230899  
(*Dondero, J., assigned justice pro tempore*)
- (3) Lopez (Dominique) a Minor, etc., v. Sony Electronics, Inc., S235357  
(*Hoffstadt, J., assigned justice pro tempore*)

**1:30 P.M.**

- (4) Samara (Rana) v. Matar (Haitham), S240918  
(*Hoch, J., assigned justice pro tempore*)
- (5) In re Manriquez (Abelino) on Habeas Corpus, [related to an underlying Automatic Appeal], S141210  
(*Franson, Jr., J., assigned justice pro tempore*)
- (6) People v. Spencer (Christopher Alan), [Automatic Appeal], S057242  
(*Hill, A. P. J., assigned justice pro tempore*)

---

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  
MAY 1, 2018**

*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, MAY 1, 2018 — 9:00 A.M.**

***(1) Troester (Douglas) v. Starbucks Corporation, S234969 (Grimes, J., assigned justice pro tempore)***

#16-286 Troester v. Starbucks Corp., S234969. (9th Cir. No. 14-55530; nonpublished order; Central District of California; 2:12-cv-07677-GAF-PJW.) Request under California Rules of Court, rule 8.548, that this court decide a question of California law presented in a matter pending in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The question presented is: Does the federal Fair Labor Standard Act's *de minimis* doctrine, as stated in *Anderson v. Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.* (1946) 328 U.S. 680, 692 and *Lindow v. United States* (9th Cir. 1984) 738 F.2d 1057, 1063, apply to claims for unpaid wages under California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1197?

***(2) Jameson (Barry S.) v. Desta (Taddese), S230899 (Dondero, J., assigned justice pro tempore)***

#16-27 Jameson v. Desta, S230899. (D066793; 241 Cal.App.4th 491; San Diego County Superior Court; GIS9465.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: In the case of a litigant who has been granted a fee waiver (Gov. Code, § 68631), can a county's superior court employ a policy that has the practical effect of denying the services of an official

court reporter to civil litigants who have been granted such a fee waiver, if the result is to preclude those litigants from procuring and providing a verbatim transcript for appellate review?

**(3) *Lopez (Dominique) a Minor, etc., v. Sony Electronics, Inc., S235357 (Hoffstadt, J., assigned justice pro tempore)***

#16-296 Lopez v. Sony Electronics, Inc., S235357. (B256792; 247 Cal.App.4th 444; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC476544.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Does the six-year limitations period in Code of Civil Procedure section 340.4, which governs actions based on birth and pre-birth injuries and is not subject to tolling for minority, or the two-year limitations period in Code of Civil Procedure section 340.8, which applies to actions for injury based upon exposure to a toxic substance and is subject to tolling for minority, govern an action alleging pre-birth injuries due to exposure to a toxic substance?

**1:30 P.M.**

**(4) *Samara (Rana) v. Matar (Haitham), S240918 (Hoch, J., assigned justice pro tempore)***

#17-164 Samara v. Matar, S240918. (B265752; 8 Cal.App.5th 796; Los Angeles County Superior Court; EC056720.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case includes the following issue: When a trial court grants a summary judgment motion on two alternative grounds, and the Court of Appeal affirms the judgment on only one ground and expressly declines to address the second, does the affirmed judgment have preclusive effect as to the second ground?

**(5) *In re Manriquez (Abelino) on Habeas Corpus, [related to an underlying Automatic Appeal], S141210 (Franson, Jr., J., assigned justice pro tempore)***

#12-70 In re Manriquez, S141210. Original proceeding. In this case, which is related to

the automatic appeal in *People v. Manriquez* (2005) 37 Cal.4th 547, the court issued an order to show cause why petitioner is not entitled to relief on the ground of juror misconduct.

***(6) People v. Spencer (Christopher Alan), [Automatic Appeal], S057242 (Hill, A. P. J., assigned justice pro tempore)***

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