



# NEWS RELEASE

Release Number: **S.C. 42/11**

Release Date: **October 21, 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 October 17, 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.]*

**#11-124 *People v. Buza, S196200.*** (A125542; 197 Cal.App.4th 1424, mod. 198 Cal.App.4th 1234a; San Francisco County Superior Court; 207818.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issue: Does the compulsory collection of biological samples from all adult felony arrestees for purposes of DNA testing (Pen. Code, §§ 296, subd. (a)(2)(C), 296.1, subd. (a)(1)(A)) violate the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution?

**#11-125 *Concerned Citizens for Responsible Government v. West Point Fire Protection Dist., S195152.*** (C061110; 196 Cal.App.4th 1427; Calaveras County Superior Court; CV33828.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Was the levy imposed by defendant for the purpose of funding fire protection services a valid assessment within the meaning of California Constitution, article XIII D, section 2, subdivision (b)?

**#11-126 *People v. Vangelder, S195423.*** (D059012; 197 Cal.App.4th 1; San Diego County Superior Court; CA221258.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. This case presents the following issue: Did the trial court prejudicially err in refusing to allow expert testimony about the accuracy of the breath-testing devices used in this case?