



Supreme Court of California
350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102-4797
www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt

NEWS RELEASE

Contact: [Cathal Conneely](mailto:Cathal.Conneely@courts.ca.gov), 415-865-7740

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

May 2, 2014

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions for Week of April 28, 2014

[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.]

#14-43 *Quesada v. Herb Thyme Farms, Inc.*, S216305. (B239602; 222 Cal.App.4th 642; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC436557.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: Does the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. § 6501 et seq.) preempt state consumer lawsuits alleging that a food product was falsely labeled “100% Organic” when it contained ingredients that were not certified organic under the California Organic Products Act of 2003 (Food & Agr. Code, § 46000 et seq.; Health & Saf. Code, § 110810 et seq.)?

#14-44 *Coleman v. Medtronic, Inc.*, S217050. (B243609; 223 Cal.App.4th 413; Los Angeles County Superior Court; SC112290.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed in part and affirmed in part the judgment in a civil action. The court ordered briefing deferred pending the disposition of the petition for certiorari in the United States Supreme Court in *Medtronic, Inc. v. Stengel*, No. 12-1351, which presents issues concerning federal preemption of state law claims relating to federally-approved medical devices.

#14-45 *In re Heard*, S216772. (D063181; 223 Cal.App.4th 115; San Diego County Superior Court; SCD193832.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal granted relief on a petition for writ of habeas corpus. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *In re Alatraste*, S214652 (#14-21), and *In re Bonilla*, S214960 (#14-22), which include the following issues: (1) Did Senate Bill 260 (Reg. Sess. 2013-2014), which includes provisions for a parole suitability hearing after a maximum of 25 years for most juvenile offenders serving life sentences, render moot any claim that such a

sentence violates the Eighth Amendment to the federal Constitution and that the petitioner is entitled to a new sentencing hearing applying the mitigating factors for such juvenile offenders set forth in *Miller v. Alabama* (2012) 567 U.S. ___ [132 S.Ct. 2455]? If not: (2) Does *Miller* apply retroactively on habeas corpus to a prisoner who was a juvenile at the time of the commitment offense and who is presently serving a sentence that is the functional equivalent of life without the possibility of parole? (3) Is a total term of imprisonment of 77 years to life (Alatrisme) or 50 years to life (Bonilla) for murder committed by a 16-year-old offender the functional equivalent of life without possibility of parole by denying the offender a meaningful opportunity for release on parole? (4) If so, does the sentence violate the Eighth Amendment absent consideration of the mitigating factors for juvenile offenders set forth in *Miller*?

#14-46 *People v. Uy*, S216253. (C063037, C063481; nonpublished opinion; San Joaquin County Superior Court; SF107288A, SF107288B.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed in part and modified and affirmed in part judgments of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Gutierrez*, S206365 (#13-01), and *People v. Moffett*, S206771 (#13-03), which present issues concerning the sentencing of juvenile offenders under Penal Code section 190.5, subdivision(b), in light of *Miller v. Alabama* (2012) 567 U.S. ___ [132 S.Ct. 2455].

STATUS

#14-42 *People v. Goolsby*, S216648. The court limited review to the issue stated in the petition for review.

###

The Supreme Court of California is the state's highest court and its decisions are binding on all other California state courts. The court's primary role is to decide matters of statewide importance and to maintain uniformity in the law throughout California by reviewing matters from the six districts of the California Courts of Appeal and the fifty-eight county superior courts (the trial courts). Among its other duties, the court also decides all capital appeals and related matters and reviews both attorney and judicial disciplinary matters.