



Supreme Court of California  
350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102-4797  
[www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt](http://www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt)

**NEWS RELEASE**

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

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

June 20, 2014

---

## **Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions for Week of June 16, 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.]*

**#14-61 *People v. Prado, S217615.*** (B243204; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; KA088341.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed judgments of conviction of a criminal offense. The court ordered briefing deferred pending finality of the decision in *People v. Chiu* (June 2, 2014, S202724) \_\_ Cal.4th \_\_, 2014 WL 2450814, which held that an aider and abettor cannot be convicted of first degree premeditated murder under the natural and probable consequences doctrine of derivative liability.

### **DISPOSITION**

The following matter was dismissed in light of the order of the United State Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit dismissing the appeal in that court after the parties settled the case:

**#13-102 *Beauchamp v. City of Long Beach, S213420.***

### **STATUS**

***People v. Grimes, S076339.*** The court invited the parties to file supplemental letter briefs addressing the following questions: (1) Does the Attorney General's failure to argue in the answer brief that an alleged error is harmless constitute forfeiture of any

harmless error argument regarding either state law errors or federal constitutional errors?  
(2) Assuming the trial court erred in excluding the hearsay statements of John Morris to Misty Abbott and Albert Lawson that were proffered by defendant as statements against interest, does the error require reversal of the special circumstances or death sentence?  
(3) Assuming that the trial court did not err in excluding Morris's statement to Abbott that after Morris killed the victim, defendant looked at him as if he were surprised, but that the trial court did err in excluding Morris's statements to Abbott and Lawson that defendant was not involved in the actual killing, does the error require reversal of the special circumstance findings or death sentence?

**#14-42 *People v. Goolsby*, S216648.** The court requested the parties to brief the following questions in addition to the question presented in the petition for review: (1) Do the jury verdict and Court of Appeal opinion establish that defendant is guilty of violating Penal Code section 451, subdivision (b), which governs arson of "an inhabited structure *or* inhabited property?" (Italics added.) (2) If so, should defendant's conviction for violating Penal Code section 451, subdivision (b), be affirmed?

###

*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.*