



**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR
LOS ANGELES SESSION
JUNE 5 and 6, 2018**

The following cases are placed upon the calendar of the Supreme Court for hearing at its courtroom in the Ronald Reagan State Office Building, 300 South Spring Street, Third Floor, North Tower, Los Angeles, California on June 5 and 6, 2018.

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 2018—2:00 P.M.

IN MEMORIAM – HON. ARMAND ARABIAN
Associate Justice, California Supreme Court (1990-1996)

- (1) In re C.B., S237801 and In re C.H., S237762, (*consolidated cases*)
(*justice pro tempore to be assigned*)
- (2) De La Torre (Eduardo) et al. v. CashCall, Inc., S241434
(*justice pro tempore to be assigned*)

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 2018—9:00 A.M.

- (3) Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, LLP v. J-M Manufacturing Co., Inc., S232946
(*justice pro tempore to be assigned*)
- (4) Bianka M., a Minor, etc. v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (Gladys M.), S233757
(*justice pro tempore to be assigned*)
- (5) Ramirez (Irma), Individually and as Personal Representative, etc., v. City of Gardena, S244549
(*justice pro tempore to be assigned*)

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
LOS ANGELES SESSION
JUNE 5 and 6, 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, JUNE 5, 2018—2:00 P.M.

IN MEMORIAM – HON. ARMAND ARABIAN
Associate Justice, California Supreme Court (1990-1996)

(1) *In re C.B., S237801 and In re C.H., S237762, (consolidated cases) (justice pro tempore to be assigned)*

#16-384 In re C.B., S237801 and #16-395 In re C.H. S237762. (A146277; 2 Cal.App.5th 1112; Superior Court of Contra Costa County; J1301073.) and (A146120; 2 Cal.App.5th 1139; Superior Court of Contra Costa County; J1100679.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order granting a petition to recall sentence. Both cases presents the following issue: Did the trial court err by refusing to order the expungement of a juvenile’s DNA record after his qualifying felony conviction was reduced to a misdemeanor under Proposition 47 (Pen. Code § 1170.18)?

(2) *De La Torre (Eduardo) et al. v. CashCall, Inc., S241434 (justice pro tempore to be assigned)*

#17-178 De La Torre (Eduardo) et al. v. CashCall, Inc., S241434. (9th Cir. No. 14-17571; 854 F.3d 1082; Northern District of California; No. 3:08-cv-03174-MEJ.) 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: Can the interest rate on consumer loans of \$2,500 or more governed by California Finance Code section 22303 render the loans unconscionable under section 22302?

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 2018—9:00 A.M.

(3) *Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, LLP v. J-M Manufacturing Co., Inc., S232946 (justice pro tempore to be assigned)*

#16-130 Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, LLP v. J-M Manufacturing Co., Inc., S232946. (B256314; 244 Cal.App.4th 590; Superior Court of Los Angeles County; YC067332.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issues: (1) May a court rely on non-legislative expressions of public policy to overturn an arbitration award on illegality grounds? (2) Can a sophisticated consumer of legal services, represented by counsel, give its informed consent to an advance waiver of conflicts of interest? (3) Does a conflict of interest that undisputedly caused no damage to the client and did not affect the value or quality of an attorney's work automatically (i) require the attorney to disgorge all previously paid fees, and (ii) preclude the attorney from recovering the reasonable value of the unpaid work?

(4) *Bianka M., a Minor, etc. v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (Gladys M.), S233757 (justice pro tempore to be assigned)*

#16-180 Bianka M., a Minor, etc. v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (Gladys M.), S233757. (B267454; 245 Cal.App.4th 406; Superior Court of Los Angeles County; BF052072.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal denied a petition for peremptory writ of mandate. This case presents the following issue: Did the trial court err in denying petitioner's request for an order making findings concerning Special Immigrant Juvenile status (8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(J); see Code Civ. Proc., § 155) and placing her in her mother's sole legal and physical custody?

(5) *Ramirez (Irma), Individually and as Personal Representative, etc., v. City of Gardena, S244549 (justice pro tempore to be assigned)*

#17-309 Ramirez (Irma), Individually and as Personal Representative, etc., v. City of Gardena, S244549. (B279873; 14 Cal.App.5th 811; Superior Court of Los Angeles County; BC609508.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: Is the immunity provided by Vehicle Code section 17004.7 available to a public agency only if all peace officers of the agency certify in writing that they have received, read, and understand the agency's vehicle pursuit policy?