SUPREME COURT MINUTES THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 2018 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S168204

PEOPLE v. MOSLEY (BARRY WENDELL)

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Ronald F. Turner's representation that the appellant's reply brief is anticipated to be filed by March 16, 2018, an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to March 16, 2018. After that date, no further extension 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).)

S170293

PEOPLE v. DENNIS (CALVIN JERMAINE) & INGRAM (REYON TWAIN)

Extension of time granted

Based upon Supervising Deputy State Public Defender Christina Spaulding's representation that the appellant Reyon T. Ingram's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by November 19, 2018, an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to March 19, 2018. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 244 additional days will be granted.

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).)

S175660

PEOPLE v. AGUIRRE (JASON ALEJANDRO)

Extension of time granted

Based upon Deputy Attorney General Warren J. Williams's representation that the respondent's brief is anticipated to be filed by May 16, 2018, an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to March 16, 2018. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 60 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).)

S199667

PEOPLE v. GRAHAM (JAWAUN DEION)

Extension of time granted

Based upon Supervising Deputy State Public Defender Jolie Lipsig's representation that the appellant's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by January 14, 2019, an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to March 19, 2018. After that date, only five further extensions totaling about 308 additional days will be granted.

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).)

S231260

B257357 Second Appellate District, Div. 6

PEOPLE v. GALLARDO (SULMA MARILYN)

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer to rehearing is extended to January 16, 2018.

S239958

A142793 First Appellate District, Div. 3

CAL FIRE LOCAL 2881 v. CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM (STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

Extension of time granted

On application of appellants and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply brief on the merits is extended to January 22, 2018.

S241647

H039705 Sixth Appellate District

PEOPLE v. MENDOZA (MARCOS)

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant Juan Ramirez and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply brief on the merits is extended to January 29, 2018.

S242244

B265937 Second Appellate District, Div. 3

PEOPLE v. GUZMAN (ALEJANDRO O.)

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 January 26, 2018.

No further extensions of time will be contemplated.

S243805

FRLEKIN (AMANDA) v. APPLE, INC.

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer brief on the merits is extended to March 19, 2018.

S246346

KLOTZ (JOSEPH) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

Transferred to Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District

The above-entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Sixth 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.