



NEWS RELEASE

Release Number: **S.C. 17/11**

Release Date: **April 29, 2011**

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF
CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS
Public Information Office
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
www.courts.ca.gov

415-865-7740

Lynn Holton
Public Information Officer

Summary of Cases Accepted During the Week of April 25, 2011

[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The statement of the issue or issues in each case set out below does not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#11-45 *People v. Gonzales, S191240.* (H032866; 192 Cal.App.4th 152; Santa Clara County Superior Court; 211111.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order of commitment as a sexually violent predator. This case presents the following issues: (1) Was defendant's statement to his psychotherapist that he had molested 16 children in the distant past properly admitted into evidence in a commitment proceeding under the Sexually Violent Predator Act pursuant to the "dangerous patient" exception to the psychotherapist-patient privilege? (2) Did the disclosure of defendant's statements violate a federal constitutional right of privacy?

#11-46 *Sargon Enterprises, Inc. v. University of Southern California, S191550.* (B202789; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC209992.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Did the trial court err in excluding proffered expert opinion testimony regarding lost profits?

#11-47 *Sharp v. Superior Court, S190646.* (B222025; 191 Cal.App.4th 1280; Ventura County Superior Court; 2008014330.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal denied a petition for peremptory writ of mandate. The court limited review to the following issue: Does Penal Code section 1054.3, subdivision (b), as amended effective January 1, 2010, alter the existing provisions of law regarding court-ordered examinations of criminal defendants in sanity proceedings, specifically Penal Code sections 1026 and 1027?

DISPOSITIONS

Review in the following case was dismissed, with the consent of all parties, in light of the settlement of the action:

#10-14 Nelson v. Exxon Mobil Corp., S179122.

The following case was transferred for reconsideration in light of *Cabral v. Ralphs Grocery Co.* (2011) 51 Cal.4th 764:

#11-09 Gonzalez v. Southern California Gas. Co., S188956.

#