

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2016
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S238033 G052058 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3 **COHEN (LAURALIN
ANDERSON & RICHARD),
MARRIAGE OF**

Time for ordering review extended on the court's own motion

The time for ordering review on the court's own motion is hereby extended to January 5, 2017.
(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(c).)

S234559 B256760 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **PEOPLE v. HAMILTON
(RICKY)**

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant Ricky Hamilton for appointment of counsel, Patricia Ulibarri is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S236164 H041615 Sixth Appellate District **PEOPLE v. SOTO (JUAQUIN
GARCIA)**

Counsel appointment order filed

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

Appellant's brief on the merits must be served and filed on or before thirty (30) days from the date of this order.

S174227 **PEOPLE v. GUERRERO
(JOSE)**

Order filed

The order filed in the above matter on October 5, 2016, is amended to read as follows:

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel J. Wilder Lee's representation that the appellant's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by January 15, 2017, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to December 5, 2016. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 42 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).)

S237866**SERMENO (LARRY A.) v. S.C.
(PEOPLE)**

Transferred to Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District

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