

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
TUESDAY, AUGUST 30, 2016
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S040704**PEOPLE v. JOHNSEN (BRIAN
DAVID)**

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy Attorney General Ryan B. McCarroll's representation that the respondent's brief is anticipated to be filed by September 13, 2016, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to September 13, 2016. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S146528**PEOPLE v. SNYDER
(JANEEN MARIE) &
THORNTON (MICHAEL
FORREST)**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant Janeen Marie Snyder and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to October 25, 2016.

S146528**PEOPLE v. SNYDER
(JANEEN MARIE) &
THORNTON (MICHAEL
FORREST)**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant Michael Thornton and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to October 25, 2016.

S166315**WILSON (ANDRE GERALD)
ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Miro F. Cizin's representation that the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is anticipated to be filed by January 30, 2017, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that document is granted to October 28, 2016. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 93 additional days are contemplated.

S181535**PEOPLE v. ALCALA
(RODNEY JAMES)**

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Mark D. Lenenberg's representation that the appellant's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by December 15, 2016, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to October 28, 2016. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 47 additional days is contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S199741**PEOPLE v. WILLIAMS
(MANLING TSANG)**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to November 7, 2016.

S234969**TROESTER (DOUGLAS) v.
STARBUCKS
CORPORATION**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the opening brief on the merits is extended to November 1, 2016.

S230899

D066793 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

**JAMESON (BARRY S.) v.
DESTA (TADDESE)**

Application to appear as counsel pro hac vice granted

The application of Paulette Brown for admission pro hac vice to appear on behalf of amicus curiae American Bar Association is hereby granted. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.40.)

S234995

E063648 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2

**PEOPLE v. HAWKINS (RYAN
JAMES)**

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Steven A. Brody is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S235166 E064214 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 **PEOPLE v. LINNEMAN, JR.,
(RONALD LEE)**

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Leonard J. Klaif is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S235695 D068554 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 **PEOPLE v. McNULTY
(BARRON M.)**

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Doris M. LeRoy is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S236806 **WILLIAMS (BRIAND) v. S.C.
(PEOPLE)**

Transferred to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District

The above-entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition must be denied.