

**SUPREME COURT COPY**

**COPY**

No. S087569

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JUAN SANCHEZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

Tulare County Case  
No. CR-40863

**SUPREME COURT  
FILED**

JAN - 5 2015

Frank A. McGuire Clerk  

---

Deputy

**APPELLANT'S OPENING BRIEF**

Appeal from the Judgment of the Superior Court  
of the State of California for the County of San Bernardino

HONORABLE JUDGE GERALD SEVIER

MICHAEL J. HERSEK  
State Public Defender

NINA WILDER  
State Bar No. 100474  
Supervising Deputy State Public Defender

1111 Broadway, 10th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607  
Telephone: (510) 267-3300  
Facsimile: (510) 452-8712  
wilder@ospd.ca.gov

Attorneys for Appellant

**DEATH PENALTY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
APPELLANT’S OPENING BRIEF .....	1
STATEMENT OF APPEALABILITY .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	4
STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	9
I. The Guilt Phase .....	9
A. Introduction .....	9
B. The Investigation .....	10
C. Appellant’s Arrest, Interrogations and Confession to Shooting Reyes and Lorena .....	19
D. Forensic Evidence .....	21
II. The Penalty Phase .....	23
A. Evidence In Aggravation .....	23
B. Evidence In Mitigation .....	24
ARGUMENT .....	27
I. APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF HIS STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS, WITNESS CONFRONTATION AND A RELIABLE GUILT AND PENALTY DETERMINATION BY THE ADMISSION OF THE TESTIMONY OF OSCAR HERNANDEZ WHO WAS NOT COMPETENT TO TESTIFY .....	27

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
A. Introduction .....	27
B. Procedural Background .....	28
1. In Limine Motions .....	28
C. Oscar Did Not Understand His Duty to Tell The Truth .....	36
D. Oscar’s Prior Statements Showed That He Did Not Understand the Difference Between Telling The Truth and Telling a Story .....	38
1. Oscar’s Statements to Detective Dempsie On The Day Of The Crimes .....	38
2. Oscar’s Statements to Prosecution Investigators Spencer and Montejano .....	38
3. Oscar’s Other Fabricated Or Contradictory Statements .....	40
4. Oscar’s Testimony During The First Trial .....	41
5. Oscar’s Testimony at The Second Trial .....	42
6. Oscar’s Voir Dire at The Instant Trial .....	43
E. The Trial Court Erred In Ruling That Oscar Was Competent to Testify .....	44

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
F. The Erroneous Admission Of Oscar’s Testimony Was Prejudicial and Requires Reversal Of Appellant’s Convictions and The Judgment Of Death Under State and Federal Law .....	48
1. The Erroneous Admission Of Oscar’s Testimony Violated Appellant’s Federal Constitutional Rights .....	48
2. The Error Was Prejudicial .....	52
II. APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF HIS STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO CONFRONTATION, DUE PROCESS AND A RELIABLE GUILT AND PENALTY DETERMINATION UNDER THE FIFTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS BY THE ADMISSION OF UNRELIABLE STATEMENTS AND TESTIMONY OF OSCAR HERNANDEZ .....	59
A. Introduction .....	59
B. Procedural History .....	60
C. The Prosecutor Failed to Establish That Oscar Had Personal Knowledge .....	62
D. The Record Establishes That Oscar Lacked a Present Recollection Of What He Personally Observed In His Home The Night His Mother and Sister Were Killed .....	63
1. Oscar’s Statements On The Day Of The Murders .....	63
2. Oscar’s Counseling By Wanda Newton .....	65

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
a. Wanda Newton’s Testimony .....	65
b. Dr. Streeter’s Testimony .....	68
3. Oscar’s Testimony at The First and Second Trials .....	70
4. Oscar’s Testimony at The Instant Trial .....	73
E. The Trial Court Abused Its Discretion In Admitting Oscar’s Unreliable and Untrustworthy Testimony .....	75
F. The Admission Of Unreliable Evidence Violated Appellant’s Right to Due Process and Cannot Be Found Harmless .....	83
<b>III. THE ERRONEOUS ADMISSION OF THE UNDULY AND IRREPARABLY SUGGESTIVE SINGLE-PHOTO LINEUP AND IN-COURT IDENTIFICATIONS VIOLATED APPELLANT’S RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, AND A RELIABLE VERDICT REQUIRING REVERSAL OF THE JUDGMENT .....</b>	<b>87</b>
A. Introduction .....	87
B. Procedural/Factual Background .....	89
1. In Limine Hearing .....	89
a. Appellant’s Single Booking Photo .....	89
b. The Six-Man Photo Lineup .....	90

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
c.    The Six-Man Live Lineup .....	92
d.    The In Limine Rulings .....	92
2.    The First Trial .....	94
3.    The Second Trial .....	96
4.    The Instant Trial .....	97
C.    The Admission Of Evidence Derived From a Suggestive Identification Procedure Violates Due Process Where The Procedure Was Conducive to Irreparable Misidentification and the Evidence Is Unreliable Under The Totality Of The Circumstances .....	102
D.    The Identification Procedures Used By The Police Were Unduly Suggestive, Unnecessary and Unreliable Under The Totality Of The Circumstances .....	106
1.    The Single-Photo Showup Was Unduly Suggestive, Unnecessary and Unreliable .....	108
2.    The Photo Lineup Was Tainted By The Single-Photo Showup and Was Cumulatively Suggestive .....	115
3.    Oscar’s In-Court Identification Was Not Reliable and Independent Of The Suggestive Identification Procedures .....	121

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
E. The Error In Admitting The Unreliable Identification Evidence Was Prejudicial and Requires Reversal Of The Judgment .....	125
IV. THE TRIAL COURT ERRONEOUSLY ALLOWED POLICE OFFICERS TO TESTIFY ABOUT HEARSAY STATEMENTS MADE BY OSCAR HERNANDEZ ON THE MORNING OF THE CRIMES .....	130
A. Relevant Facts .....	130
B. The Trial Court Erred In Admitting Oscar’s Statements as Spontaneous Declarations .....	132
1. The Legal Standard .....	132
2. Oscar’s Statements to Sergeant Dempsie .....	135
3. Oscar’s Statements to Detective Kroutil .....	138
C. The Trial Court Erred In Admitting Oscar’s Statements to Kroutil as a Prior Consistent Statements .....	139
D. Oscar’s Statements to Detective Kroutil Were Not Admissible as Past Recollection Recorded .....	143
E. The Error in Admitting Oscar’s Prior Statements Was Prejudicial and Requires Reversal Of The Judgment .....	147

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
V. THE TRIAL COURT’S ERRONEOUS RESTRICTION OF APPELLANT’S RIGHT TO IMPEACH OSCAR HERNANDEZ REQUIRES REVERSAL OF THE JUDGMENT .....	149
A. Introduction .....	149
B. Factual Background .....	150
1. Statements Made to Montejano and Spencer In Idaho On November 4, 1997 .....	151
2. Oscar’s Statements to His Father .....	153
3. Oscar’s Testimony .....	155
4. Oscar’s Inability Or Unwillingness to Recall .....	156
C. The Right to Challenge The Credibility Of a Witness Is Very Broad and Encompasses Both The Witness’s Willingness and Capacity to Tell The Truth .....	157
D. The Trial Court Misapplied The Law In Restricting Impeachment Of Oscar .....	160
1. The Proffered Impeachment Evidence Was Admissible as Nonhearsay .....	161
2. Oscar’s Prior Statements and Testimony Were Inconsistent With His Testimony at The Instant Trial .....	163



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
3. Oscar’s Former Testimony Was Admissible Under Evidence Code Sections 1291 and 240 .....	167
4. Oscar’s Prior Statements Were Admissible Under Evidence Code Section 1237 .....	169
E. The Trial Court’s Error Denied Appellant His Rights to Confront Witnesses and Present a Defense, to Due Process and to a Fair Trial .....	170
F. The Erroneous Exclusion Of Vital Impeachment Evidence Was Prejudicial and Requires Reversal Of The Judgment .....	173
VI. THE TRIAL COURT PREJUDICIALLY ERRED BY UNDULY RESTRICTING THE TESTIMONY OF DEFENSE EXPERT DR. SUSAN STREETER WITH RESPECT TO FACTORS BEARING ON OSCAR’S COMPETENCY AND RELIABILITY AS A WITNESS .....	178
A. Introduction .....	178
B. The Trial Court’s Broad Discretion to Exclude Or Limit Expert Testimony Is Subject to The Defendant’s Constitutional Right to Present a Defense .....	179
C. The Trial Court Abused Its Discretion By Unduly Restricting The Scope Of Dr. Streeter’s Testimony .....	183

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
1. The Trial Court Improperly Barred Consideration Of Oscar’s Prior Statements and Testimony On The Ground That They Constituted Incompetent Hearsay .....	184
2. The Trial Court Improperly Barred Consideration Of Oscar’s Prior Statements and Testimony On The Ground That The Issues Of Oscar’s “Competency” and Reliability Were For The Jury .....	189
D. The Trial Court’s Error Was Prejudicial .....	192
VII. APPELLANT’S CONFESSION WAS OBTAINED IN VIOLATION OF <i>MIRANDA</i> AND THE FIFTH AMENDMENT WHERE POLICE IGNORED APPELLANT’S INVOCATION OF HIS RIGHT TO REMAIN SILENT AND WHERE HIS CONFESSION WAS OBTAINED THROUGH THE COERCIVE PRESSURES OF SUCCESSIVE INTERROGATIONS .....	193
A. Introduction .....	193
B. Factual and Procedural Background .....	194
1. The Police Interrogations .....	194
2. The Trial Court’s Rulings .....	203
3. Relevant Evidence Introduced and Argument Regarding Appellant’s Confession .....	204

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
C. Appellant’s Confession Was Obtained In Violation Of His Right to Remain Silent .....	205
1. A Custodial Interrogation Must Cease When a Suspect Invokes His Right to Remain Silent .....	205
2. The Police Ignored Appellant’s Unequivocal and Unambiguous Invocation Of His Right To Remain Silent .....	207
D. Appellant’s Confession Was Involuntary Because It Was Elicited By Psychological Threats and Coercion and In Violation Of His Right to Consular Notification .....	212
E. The Erroneous Admission Of Appellant’s Confession Was Prejudicial .....	218
VIII. THE TRIAL COURT COMMITTED REVERSIBLE ERROR, WHEN IT PERMITTED THE PROSECUTION TO ELICIT EVIDENCE OF APPELLANT’S HOMOSEXUAL RELATIONSHIP WITH PROSECUTION WITNESS HECTOR HERNANDEZ BECAUSE ITS PREJUDICIAL EFFECT SUBSTANTIALLY OUTWEIGHED ANY PROBATIVE VALUE IT MIGHT HAVE .....	221
A. Introduction .....	221
B. Factual Background .....	222
1. Hernandez’s Pretrial Statement .....	223

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
2. Relevant Proceedings at The First Guilt Phase Trial .....	224
3. Relevant Proceedings at The Second Guilt Phase Trial .....	226
4. Relevant Proceedings at The Instant Trial .....	226
5. The Trial Court's Ruling .....	231
6. The Cautionary and Limiting Instructions .....	233
 C. The Trial Court Abused Its Discretion and Committed Reversible Error When It Allowed the Prosecutor to Question Witnesses About Appellant's Homosexual Relationship With Hernandez, and Instructed The Jury That It Could Consider Evidence Of Such Homosexual Relationship For Multiple Purposes In Addition to Showing Hernandez's Bias .....	 239
1. The Evidence That Hernandez Had a Longstanding Homosexual Relationship Was Irrelevant to Any Issue Bearing On Appellant's Guilt .....	240
a. Hernandez's Credibility and Bias .....	242
b. Appellant's Statements to Shear Regarding His Homosexual Relationship with Hernandez .....	245

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
c. Without Limitation, The Credibility and Believability Of Appellant's Testimony .....	246
2. The Evidence Of The Consensual Homosexual Relationship Between Appellant and Hernandez Was Unduly Prejudicial In Violation Of Evidence Code Section 352 .....	246
D. The Trial Court's Limiting Instructions Did Not Mitigate The Prejudice Caused By Its Rulings .....	249
E. The Admission Of Evidence Of Appellant's Homosexual Relationship Violated Due Process and Was Prejudicial .....	255
IX. THE CROSS-EXAMINATION AND IMPEACHMENT OF APPELLANT ABOUT HIS HOMOSEXUAL RELATIONSHIP WITH HECTOR HERNANDEZ, INCLUDING POST-INVOCATION STATEMENTS SUPPRESSED BY THE COURT, VIOLATED APPELLANT'S RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL AND HIS <i>MIRANDA</i> RIGHTS UNDER <i>HARRIS v. NEW YORK</i> .....	258
A. Introduction .....	258
B. Factual Background .....	259
C. The Cross-Examination Of Appellant Concerning The Inflammatory, Collateral Matter Of The Frequency Of His Sexual Activities With Hernandez Was Error .....	267

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
D. The Cross-Examination About Appellant’s Post-Invocation Statements to Garay About His Sexual Relationship With Hernandez Violated <i>Miranda</i> .....	271
E. The Error Was Prejudicial and Requires Reversal Of Appellant’s Convictions, The Rape Special Circumstance and The Judgment of Death .....	274
X. THE ADMISSION OF GENERIC GUN EVIDENCE WAS INADMISSIBLE UNDER EVIDENCE CODE SECTIONS 1101 SUBSECTIONS (a) AND (b), AND UNDULY PREJUDICIAL UNDER EVIDENCE CODE SECTION 352 .....	279
A. Appellant’s Alleged Statements to Berrera or Perez Regarding Possession Of a Gun Were Inadmissible Propensity Evidence .....	280
B. The Gun Evidence Should Have Been Excluded Under Evidence Code Section 352 .....	281
C. The Erroneous Admission Of The Gun Evidence Was Not Harmless, Requiring Reversal Of The Guilt Verdicts and Death Sentence .....	283
XI. THE TRIAL COURT ABROGATED ITS DUTY TO ENSURE APPELLANT RECEIVED A FAIR TRIAL AND DUE PROCESS OF LAW WHEN IT PERMITTED THE PROSECUTION TO IMPLY THAT MOTIVE EVIDENCE EXISTED TYING APPELLANT TO THE KILLING OF ERMANDA REYES WITHOUT REQUIRING A SHOWING THAT ANY WITNESS POSSESSED PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF SUCH A MOTIVE .....	286

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
A. Factual Background .....	286
B. The Trial Court Failed To Fulfill Its Duty to Ensure That Incriminatory Information Would Not Be Placed Before The Jury Unless That Information Could Be Said to Be Based On a Witness's Personal Knowledge .....	290
C. The Trial Court's Instructions to The Jury Did Not Cure The Error Arising From The Failure to Resolve This Issue Prior to Permitting These Witnesses to Testify .....	295
D. The Trial Court's Error Permitted The Prosecution to Place Harmful Innuendo Before The Jury Which Prejudiced Appellant and Resulted In a Denial Of His Right to a Fair Trial and Due Process Of Law .....	299
XII. THE PROSECUTOR COMMITTED PREJUDICIAL MISCONDUCT BY PRESENTING INADMISSIBLE, UNRELIABLE AND HIGHLY INFLAMMATORY HEARSAY EVIDENCE OF AN ALLEGED STATEMENT BY APPELLANT INDICATING A MOTIVE FOR THE MURDERS. THE COURT'S ADMONITIONS FAILED TO CURE THE PREJUDICE AND REVERSAL IS REQUIRED .....	303
A. Introduction .....	303
B. The Relevant Facts .....	304

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
C. The Prosecutor Lacked a Good Faith Belief That He Had Admissible Evidence of Appellant's Statement to Reyes Demanding Payment and Stating That If She Did Not Pay Him, Her Daughter Would Pay .....	311
D. The Prosecutor Committed Misconduct By Failing to Admonish Ortiz, Zepeda and Palomares Before Calling Them to The Witness Stand .....	315
E. The Prosecutor's Misconduct Violated Appellant's Right to Confrontation and a Fair Trial; The Trial Court's Admonitions Failed to Cure The Error and Reversal Is Required .....	319
XIII. THE PROSECUTOR COMMITTED PREJUDICIAL MISCONDUCT DURING HIS GUILT PHASE CLOSING ARGUMENT .....	323
A. The Prosecutor Committed Misconduct By Inviting The Jury to Imagine Reyes's Last Thoughts .....	323
B. Reversal Is Required .....	325
XIV. THE EVIDENCE WAS INSUFFICIENT UNDER PENAL CODE SECTION 190.3, FACTOR (b), TO SHOW THAT APPELLANT COMMITTED AN UNLAWFUL BATTERY WHEN HE TAPPED HIS STEPDAUGHTER'S HEAD .....	327
A. Introduction .....	327
B. Appellant's Alleged Discipline Of His Stepdaughter Was Not a Crime .....	328



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
C. The Error Was Prejudicial .....	330
XV. REVERSAL OF THE JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION AND THE SENTENCE OF DEATH IS REQUIRED BASED ON THE CUMULATIVE EFFECT OF ERRORS THAT COLLECTIVELY UNDERMINED THE FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS OF APPELLANT'S TRIAL AND THE RELIABILITY OF THE RESULTING DEATH JUDGMENT .....	332
XVI. CALIFORNIA'S DEATH PENALTY STATUTE, AS INTERPRETED BY THIS COURT AND APPLIED AT APPELLANT'S TRIAL, VIOLATES THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION .....	335
A. Penal Code Section 190.2 Is Impermissibly Broad .....	335
B. The Broad Application Of Section 190.3, Subdivision (a) Violated Appellant's Constitutional Rights .....	336
C. The Death Penalty Statute and Accompanying Jury Instructions Fail to Set Forth The Appropriate Burden of Proof .....	338
1. Appellant's Death Sentence Is Unconstitutional Because It Is Not Premised On Findings Made Beyond a Reasonable Doubt .....	338
2. Some Burden of Proof Is Required, Or The Jury Should Have Been Instructed That There Was No Burden Of Proof .....	340

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
3. Appellant's Death Verdict Was Not Premised On Unanimous Jury Findings .....	341
a. Aggravating Factors .....	341
b. Unadjudicated Criminal Activity .....	342
4. The Instructions Caused The Penalty Determination to Turn On an Impermissibly Vague and Ambiguous Standard .....	344
5. The Instructions Failed to Inform The Jurors That If They Determined That Mitigation Outweighed Aggravation, They Were Required to Return a Sentence Of Life Without The Possibility Of Parole .....	344
6. The Penalty Jury Should Be Instructed On The Presumption Of Life .....	345
D. Failing to Require That The Jury Make Written Findings Violates Appellant's Right to Meaningful Appellate Review .....	346
E. The Instructions to The Jury On Mitigating and Aggravating Factors Violated Appellant's Constitutional Rights .....	347
1. The Use Of Restrictive Adjectives In The List Of Potential Mitigating Factors .....	347

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
2. The Failure to Delete Inapplicable Sentencing Factors .....	347
F. The Prohibition Against Intercase Proportionality Review Guarantees Arbitrary and Disproportionate Impositions Of The Death Penalty .....	348
G. California’s Capital Sentencing Scheme Violates The Equal Protection Clause .....	348
H. California’s Use Of The Death Penalty as a Regular Form Of Punishment Falls Short Of International Norms .....	349
CONCLUSION .....	350
CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL	
APPENDIX A	

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**FEDERAL CASES**

*Anderson v. Terhune*  
(9th Cir. 2008) 516 F.3d 781 ..... 206

*Apprendi v. New Jersey*  
(2000) 530 U.S. 466 ..... 338, 339, 343

*Arizona v. Fulminante*  
(1991) 499 U.S. 279 ..... 218, 219

*Arnold v. Runnels*  
(9th Cir. 2005) 421 F.3d 859 ..... 206, 207, 208

*Ashcraft v. Tennessee*  
(1945) 322 U.S. 143 ..... 213

*Beck v. Alabama*  
(1980) 447 U.S. 625 ..... passim

*Berghius v. Thompkins*  
(2010) 560 U.S. 370 ..... 206, 259

*Blakely v. Washington*  
(2004) 542 U.S. 296 ..... 338, 339, 343

*Boyde v. California*  
(1990) 494 U.S. 370 ..... 344

*California v. Green*  
(1970) 399 U.S. 149 ..... 157

*Carter v. Kentucky*  
(1981) 450 U.S. 288 ..... 339

*Chambers v. Mississippi*  
(1973) 410 U.S. 284 ..... 160, 172, 179, 334

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

<i>Chapman v. California</i> (1967) 386 U.S. 18 .....	passim
<i>Colorado v. Connolly</i> (1986) 479 U.S. 157 .....	193, 213
<i>Connecticut v. Barrett</i> (1987) 479 U.S. 523 .....	207
<i>Crane v. Kentucky</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 683 .....	157
<i>Darden v. Wainwright</i> (1986) 477 U.S. 168 .....	319
<i>Davis v. Alaska</i> (1974) 415 U.S. 308 .....	158
<i>Davis v. North Carolina</i> (1966) 384 U.S. 737 .....	213
<i>Davis v. United States</i> (2013) 512 U.S. 452 .....	206, 209
<i>Delaware v. Van Arsdall</i> (1986) 475 U.S. 673 .....	157, 158
<i>Delo v. Lashley</i> (1983) 507 U.S. 272. ....	346
<i>Derrick v. Peterson</i> (9th Cir. 1991) 924 F.2d 813 .....	214
<i>Donnelly v. DeChrisoforo</i> (1974) 416 U.S. 637 .....	83, 319

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Dunn v. United States</i> (5th Cir. 1962) 307 F.2d 883 .....	297
<i>Edwards v. Arizona</i> (1981) 451 U.S. 477. ....	193
<i>Estelle v. Williams</i> (1976) 425 U.S. 501 .....	345
<i>Fahy v. Connecticut</i> (1963) 375 U.S. 85 .....	219
<i>Ford v. Wainwright</i> (1986) 477 U.S. 399 .....	59, 85, 295
<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> (1972) 408 U.S. 238 .....	335
<i>Gardner v. Florida</i> (1977) 430 U.S. 349 .....	302
<i>Ghent v. Woodford</i> (9th Cir. 2002) 279 F.3d 1121 .....	220, 274, 301
<i>Giglio v. United States</i> (1972) 405 U.S. 150 .....	160
<i>Goldsmith v. Witkowski</i> (4th Cir. 1992) 481 F.2d 697 .....	297
<i>Green v. Georgia</i> (1979) 442 U.S. 95 .....	160, 172
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 153 .....	85, 346

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

<i>Haliym v. Mitchell</i> (6th Cir. 2007) 492 F.3d 680] .....	122, 123, 124
<i>Harmelin v. Michigan</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 957 .....	342
<i>Harris v. New York</i> (1971) 401 U.S. 222 .....	passim
<i>Harrison v. United States</i> (1968) 392 U.S. 219 .....	212
<i>Haynes v. State of Washington</i> (1963) 373 U.S. 503 .....	216
<i>Hicks v. Oklahoma</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 343 .....	340, 345
<i>Holmes v. South Carolina</i> (2006) 547 U.S. 319 .....	159, 170, 171
<i>Hoover v. Ronwin</i> (1984) 466 U.S. 558 .....	222
<i>Hurd v. Terhune</i> (9th Cir. 2010) 619 F.3d 1080 .....	207
<i>Idaho v. Wright</i> (1990) 497 U.S. 805 .....	76
<i>Israel v. Odom</i> (7th Cir. 1975) 521 F.2d 1370 .....	107, 108
<i>Jackson v. Denno</i> (1964) 378 U.S. 368 .....	75, 213, 294

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Jackson v. Fogg</i> (2nd Cir. 1978) 589 F.2d 108 .....	102
<i>James v. Illinois</i> (1990) 493 U.S. 307 .....	273
<i>Johnson v. Mississippi</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 578 .....	179, 343
<i>Kennedy v. Louisiana</i> (2008) 554 U.S. 407 .....	60
<i>Kyles v. Whitley</i> (1995) 514 U.S. 419 .....	52, 220
<i>Lawrence v. Texas</i> (2003) 539 U.S. 558 .....	239, 247
<i>Lockett v. Ohio</i> (1978) 438 U.S. 586 .....	347
<i>Lujan v. Garcia</i> (9th Cir. 2013) 734 F.3d 917 .....	212
<i>Lynum v. Illinois</i> (1963) 372 U.S. 528 .....	216
<i>Madrigal v. Yates</i> (C.D. Cal. 2009) 662 F.Supp.2d 1162 .....	176
<i>Manson v. Brathwaite</i> (1977) 432 U.S. 98 .....	passim
<i>Maynard v. Cartwright</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 356 .....	337, 344



**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

<i>McKoy v. North Carolina</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 433 .....	341
<i>Michigan v. Harvey</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 344 .....	273
<i>Michigan v. Mosley</i> (1975) 423 U.S. 96 .....	206, 208, 210, 211
<i>Miranda v. Arizona</i> (1966) 384 U.S. 436 .....	passim
<i>Monge v. California</i> (1998) 524 U.S. 721 .....	342
<i>Moore v. Illinois</i> (1977) 434 U.S. 220 .....	117
<i>Myers v. Ylst</i> (9th Cir. 1990) 897 F.2d 417 .....	342
<i>Napue v. Illinois</i> (1959) 360 U.S. 264 .....	173
<i>Neil v. Biggers</i> (1972) 409 U.S. 188 .....	103, 104, 105, 122
<i>Olden v. Kentucky</i> (1988) 488 U.S. 227 .....	158
<i>Oliva v. Hedgepeth</i> (C.D. Cal. 2009) 600 F.Supp.2d 1067 .....	121, 122, 123, 124
<i>Oregon v. Hass</i> (1975) 420 U.S. 714 .....	273

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Ouber v. Guarino</i> (1st Cir. 2002) 293 F.3d 19 .....	176
<i>Parle v. Runnels</i> (9th Cir. 2007) 505 F.3d 922 .....	334
<i>Payton v. Woodford</i> (9th Cir. 2002) 299 F.3d 815. ....	314
<i>Pennsylvania v. Ritchie</i> (1987) 480 U.S. 39 .....	157
<i>Perry v. New Hampshire</i> (2012) _U.S. _, 132 S.Ct. 716 .....	103
<i>People of Territory of Guam v. Shymanovitz</i> (9th Cir. 1998) 157 F.3d 1154 .....	249
<i>Pointer v. Texas</i> (1965) 380 U.S. 400 .....	158
<i>Ring v. Arizona</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 584 .....	338, 339, 341, 343
<i>Ristiano v. Ross</i> (1976) 424 U.S. 589 .....	254
<i>Rock v. Arkansas</i> (1987) 483 U.S. 44 .....	159
<i>Rojas v. Richardson</i> (5th Cir. 1983) 703 F.2d 186 .....	249
<i>Roper v. Simmons</i> (2005) 543 U.S. 551 .....	349

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
<i>Rosales-Lopez v. United States</i> (1981) 451 U.S. 182 .....	253
<i>Sanchez-Llamas v. Oregon</i> (2006) 548 U.S. 331 .....	193, 218
<i>Shepard v. United States</i> (1933) 290 U.S. 96 .....	249
<i>Shirley v. Yates</i> (E.D. Calif. 2013) 950 F.Supp.2d 1141 .....	105, 106
<i>Smith v. Illinois</i> (1968) 390 U.S. 129 .....	158
<i>Simmons v. United States</i> (1968) 390 U.S. 377 .....	106, 107, 108
<i>SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Abbott Laboratories</i> (9th Cir. 2014) 740 F.2d 471 .....	245, 270
<i>Spaziano v. Florida</i> (1986) 468 U.S. 399 .....	85, 302
<i>Stansbury v. California</i> (1994) 511 U.S. 318 .....	323
<i>Stovall v. Denno</i> (1967) 388 U.S. 293 .....	108
<i>Sullivan v. Louisiana</i> (1993) 508 U.S. 275 .....	passim
<i>Thomas v. Hubbard</i> (9th Cir. 2001) 273 F.3d 1164 .....	314, 320

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
<i>Trop v. Dulles</i> (1958) 356 U.S. 86 .....	349
<i>Tuilaepa v. California</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 967 .....	337
<i>United States v. Amano</i> (9th Cir. 2000) 229 F.3d 801 .....	218
<i>United States v. Baldwin</i> (9th Cir. 1979) 607 F.2d 1295 .....	253
<i>United States v. Barber</i> (4th Cir. 1996) 80 F.3d 964 .....	254
<i>United States v. Beckman</i> (8th Cir. 2000) 222 F.3d 512 .....	325
<i>United States v. ex rel. Hampton v. Leibach</i> (7th Cir. 2003) 347 F.3d 219 .....	176
<i>United States v. Gillespie</i> (9th Cir. 1988) 852 F.2d 475 .....	247, 249, 252
<i>United States v. Green</i> (3d Cir. 2010) 617 F.3d 233 .....	160, 183
<i>United States v. Greene</i> (4th Cir. 2013) 704 F.3d 298 .....	103
<i>United States v. Gutierrez de Lopez</i> (10th Cir. 2014) 761 F.3d 1123 .....	158
<i>United States v. Hoffner</i> (10th Cir. 1985) 777 F.2d 1423 .....	76

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

<i>United States v. Johnson</i> (4th Cir. 1997) 114 F.3d 435 .....	108
<i>United States v. Lopez-Alvarez</i> (9th Cir. 1992) 970 F.2d 583 .....	159, 160, 173
<i>United States v. Owens</i> (1988) 484 U.S. 554 .....	49
<i>United States v. Preston</i> (9th Cir. 2014) 731 F.3d 1008 .....	214
<i>United States v. Rondon</i> (S.D.N.Y. 1985) 614 F.Supp. 667 .....	211
<i>United States v. Russell</i> (6th Cir. 1976) 532 F.2d 1063 .....	102
<i>United States v. Salerno</i> (1992) 505 U.S. 317 .....	141
<i>United States v. Scheffer</i> (1998) 523 U.S. 303 .....	159
<i>United States v. Schindler</i> (9th Cir. 1980) 614 F.2d 227 .....	297
<i>United States v. Smith</i> (9th Cir. 1977) 563 F.2d 1361 .....	102
<i>United States v. Tingle</i> (9th Cir. 1981) 658 F.2d 1332 .....	216
<i>United States v. Wade</i> (1967) 388 U.S. 218 .....	passim

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
<i>United States v. Washington</i> (D.C.Cir. 1994) 12 F.3d 1128 .....	108
<i>United States v. White</i> (7th Cir. 2000) 222 F.3d 363 .....	325
<i>Vasquez v. Hillery</i> (1986) 474 U.S. 254 .....	335
<i>Walder v. United States</i> (1954) 347 U.S. 62 .....	272
<i>Wardius v. Oregon</i> (1973) 412 U.S. 470 .....	345
<i>Washington v. Texas</i> (1967) 388 U.S. 14 .....	157, 179
<i>Watkins v. Sowders</i> (1981) 449 U.S. 341 .....	125
<i>Whalen v. Roe</i> (1977) 429 U.S. 589 .....	329
<i>Wilcox v. Ford</i> (11th Cir. 1987) 813 F.2d 1140 .....	83
<i>Williams v. Woodford</i> (E.D. Cal. 2012) 859 F.Supp.2d 1154 .....	176
<i>Withrow v. Williams</i> (1993) 507 U.S. 680 .....	213
<i>Woodson v. North Carolina</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 280 .....	180, 341

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

*Young v. Conway*  
(2d Cir. 2013) 715 F.3d 79 ..... 103

*Zant v. Stephens*  
(1983) 462 U.S. 862 ..... 180, 335

**STATE CASES**

*Adamson v. Department of Social Services*  
(1988) 207 Cal.App.3d 14 ..... 37

*Bisno v. Douglas Emmett Realty Fund 1988*  
(2009) 174 Cal.App.4th 1534 ..... 170

*Blakeney v. Texas*  
(Tex.App.1995) 911 S.W.2d 508 ..... 247

*Brodes v. State*  
(2005) 279 Ga. 435, 614 S.E.2d 766 ..... 123

*Bryant v. Commonwealth*  
(Va. App. 1990) 393 S.E.2d 216 ..... 108, 122

*City of Kalispell v. Miller*  
(Mont. 2010) 230 P.3d 792 ..... 243, 244, 248

*Commonwealth v. Delbridge*  
(Pa. 2003) 855 A.2d 27 ..... 80, 81

*Continental Airlines v. McDonnell Douglas Corp.*  
(1989) 216 Cal.App.3d 388 ..... 181

*Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Superior Court*  
(2009) 47 Cal.4th 725 ..... 259

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

<i>English v. Wyoming</i> (Wyo. 1999) 982 P.2d 139 .....	81
<i>Evangelatos v. Superior Court</i> (1988) 44 Cal.3d 1188 .....	253
<i>In re Charlisse C.</i> (2008) 45 Cal.4th 145 .....	170
<i>In re Cindy L.</i> (1997) 17 Cal. 4th 15 .....	passim
<i>In re Martin</i> (1987) 44 Cal.3d 1 .....	157
<i>In re Michael B.</i> (1983) 149 Cal.App.3d 1073 .....	105
<i>People v. Alcala</i> (1992) 4 Cal.4th 742 .....	156, 167, 168
<i>People v. Alexander</i> (2010) 49 Cal.4th 846 .....	101
<i>People v. Anderson</i> (1987) 43 Cal.3d 1104 .....	249, 274, 321
<i>People v. Anderson</i> (2001) 25 Cal.4th 543 .....	passim
<i>People v. Archer</i> (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 1380 .....	163
<i>People v. Arias</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 92 .....	323, 340, 346



**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

<i>People v. Avila</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 491 .....	347
<i>People v. Babbitt</i> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 660 .....	179
<i>People v. Badgett</i> (1995) 10 Cal.4th 330 .....	83
<i>People v. Balderas</i> (1985) 41 Cal.3d 144 .....	330
<i>People v. Barnett</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 1044 .....	322
<i>People v. Barnwell</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4th 1038 .....	280
<i>People v. Bell</i> (1989) 49 Cal.3d 502 .....	325
<i>People v. Benson</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 754 .....	213, 326
<i>People v. Black</i> (2014) 58 Cal.4th 912 .....	337
<i>People v. Blair</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 686 .....	337, 339
<i>People v. Bolden</i> (2002) 29 Cal.4th 515 .....	311
<i>People v. Bolton</i> (1979) 23 Cal.3d 208 .....	319, 325

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>People v. Bordelon</i> (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 1311 .....	186
<i>People v. Boyce</i> (2014) 59 Cal.4th 672 .....	278
<i>People v. Boyd</i> (1985) 38 Cal.3d 762 .....	330
<i>People v. Bramit</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 1221 .....	329
<i>People v. Brandon</i> (1995) 32 Cal.App.4th 1033 .....	115
<i>People v. Breaux</i> (1991) 1 Cal.4th 281 .....	344
<i>People v. Brown</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 432 .....	129, 328, 330
<i>People v. Brown</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 382 .....	337
<i>People v. Bryant</i> (2014) 60 Cal.4th 335 .....	162
<i>People v. Bui</i> (2001) 86 Cal.App.4th 1187 .....	180
<i>People v. Bunyard</i> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 1189 .....	300
<i>People v. Cahill</i> (1993) 5 Cal.4th 478 .....	219