

No. S150509

SUPREME COURT COPY

COPY

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)
)
 Plaintiff and Respondent,)
)
 v.)
)
 SANTIAGO PINEDA,)
)
 Defendant and Appellant.)

Los Angeles Co. Sup. Ct.
No. NA051943-01 c/w
NA061271-01

SUPREME COURT
FILED

AUG 21 2014

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 Los Angeles

HONORABLE WILLIAM R. POUNDERS

MICHAEL HERSEK
California State Public Defender

GARY D. GARCIA
Senior Deputy State Public Defender
California Bar No. 157612

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

Attorneys for Appellant

DEATH PENALTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	xiii
STATEMENT OF APPEALABILITY	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS	10
I. Prosecution Case at the Guilt Phase	10
A. March 7, 2002, Murder of Juan Carlos Armenta (Rafael Sanchez)	10
1. Testimony of Raul Tinajero	10
2. Testimony of Eduardo Quevedo	14
3. Testimony of Patricia Armenta	15
4. Testimony of Virginia Ramos and David Rodriguez	15
5. Testimony Relating to the Crime Scene	17
6. Forensic Evidence	20
B. The Murder of Raul Tinajero	25
1. Evidence Regarding the Crime and Subsequent Investigation	25
a. Testimony of Raul Tinajero's Cellmates and Related Witnesses	25
(i) Anthony Sloan	26
(ii) Andrew Stein	33

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
(iii) Valerie Gorman	35
(iv) Matthew Good	35
(v) Gregory Palacol	40
(vi) Dennis Wirt	45
b. Evidence Regarding Investigation of the Crime	45
c. Forensic Evidence	52
d. Evidence Regarding Appellant's Opportunity to Move Around the Jail	56
2. Appellant's Statements to Jail Personnel	60
3. Evidence Relating To Appellant's Gang Membership and To Gang Culture and Activity Generally	62
4. "Other Acts" Evidence Admitted Pursuant to Evidence Code Section 1101, Subdivision (b)	66
II. Defense Case at the Guilt Phase	68
A. Appellant's Testimony	68
B. Toxicology Evidence	77
C. Rebuttal	79
III. Prosecution Case At the Penalty Phase	79
A. Victim Impact Evidence	79
B. Evidence Introduced Pursuant to Penal Code Section 190.3, Factor (b)	81

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
IV. Defense Case at the Penalty Phase	82
A. Testimony of Family Members and Friends	82
B. Testimony of School Personnel	95
C. Testimony of Clinical Psychologist Adrienne Davis	97
D. Testimony of Correctional Consultant James Esten	102
V. Prosecution Rebuttal Evidence	104
ARGUMENTS	106
I THE TRIAL COURT'S ERRONEOUS EXCLUSION FOR CAUSE OF PROSPECTIVE JUROR JAMES WILIA REQUIRES REVERSAL OF APPELLANT'S DEATH JUDGMENT	106
A. Introduction	106
B. The Controlling Law	106
C. Excusal of Prospective Juror Wilia	110
1. The Voir Dire Procedure Utilized at Appellant's Trial	110
2. Juror Wilia's Questionnaire Responses	110
3. Voir Dire of Prospective Juror Wilia	112
4. Trial Court's Grant of the Prosecutor's Challenge for Cause ...	115
D. Prospective Juror Wilia Was Not Substantially Impaired Within the Meaning of the <i>Adams-Witt</i> Standard	118
E. Conclusion	132

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
II THE TRIAL COURT VIOLATED APPELLANT’S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS AND A RELIABLE DETERMINATION OF GUILT BY PERMITTING THE PROSECUTION TO INTRODUCE IRRELEVANT, INFLAMMATORY EVIDENCE, FAILING TO GUIDE THE JURY’S CONSIDERATION OF THAT EVIDENCE, AND ALLOWING THE PROSECUTION TO URGE THE JURY TO DRAW IMPROPER INFERENCES FROM IT	133
A. Factual and Procedural History	133
1. Prosecution’s Requests for Admission of “Other Crimes/Acts” Evidence and Trial Court’s Rulings	133
2. “Other Acts” Evidence Presented to the Jury, and the Prosecution’s Closing Argument	140
(a) December 19, 2003, Escape Attempt	140
(b) March 13, 2003, Shank Possession	142
(c) July 13, 2004, Possession of Razor and Syringe	143
(d) On October 13, 2004, Appellant Was Observed Without His Wristband	144
(e) On November 5, 2004, Appellant Was Observed Without His Wristband	144
(f) June 17, 2005, Possession of Altered Paper Clip	145
(g) July 30, 2005, Escape From Locked Shower	146
(h) Evidence Relating to Appellant’s Telephone Calls and Letters To Irma Limas	147
3. Prosecutor’s Argument and Pertinent Jury Instructions	147

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
B. The Trial Court Erred in Admitting The “Other-Acts” Evidence	150
1. Legal Principles	150
2. The “Other-Acts” Evidence Was Irrelevant and Inadmissible Under Evidence Code Section 1101, Subdivisions (a) and (b) . .	154
a. Evidence Relating to Appellant’s December 19, 2003, Escape Attempt Had No Probative Value	158
b. Appellant’s Possession of “Shank Weapons” and An Altered Paper Clip Had No Probative Value	160
c. Evidence That Appellant Was Found Without His Identification Bracelet Lacked Probative Value	161
d. Appellant’s July 30, 2005, Escape From a Locked Shower Lacked Probative Value	163
e. Appellant’s Letters and Telephone Calls to Irma Limas Lacked Probative Value	165
4. The Trial Court Abused Its Discretion In Failing To Exclude the Other-Acts Evidence Under Evidence Code Section 352 . . .	166
C. The Erroneous Admission of the Evidence Was Highly Prejudicial and Deprived Appellant of His Fourteenth Amendment Right to Due Process and a Fair Trial, and His Eighth Amendment Right to a Reliable Determination of Guilt	169
III THE TRIAL COURT PREJUDICIALLY ERRED IN ADMITTING EVIDENCE OF APPELLANT’S GANG MEMBERSHIP	177
A. Factual Background	177
1. Evidence Relating to Communications Between Appellant and Irma Limas	177

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
2. Evidence Relating To Appellant’s Gang Affiliation, and to Gang Culture and Activity In The County Jail	179
3. Evidence Used to Impeach Appellant’s Denial That He Was a Sureno Member	184
B. Legal Authority	186
C. Evidence Regarding Hispanic Gangs and Appellant’s Gang Membership Was Irrelevant and Inadmissible for Any Legitimate Purpose	190
D. The Prejudice of the Gang Evidence Was Not Cured By a Proper Limiting Instruction	196
E. The Erroneous Admission of the Gang Evidence was Prejudicial, Violated Appellant’s Due Process Right to a Fair Trial, and Requires That the Judgment Be Reversed	198
IV THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN ALLOWING THE PROSECUTOR TO ELICIT IRRELEVANT, PREJUDICIAL HEARSAY THAT APPELLANT HAD POSSESSED “SHANKS”	202
A. Introduction	202
B. Testimony Regarding the Deputy Sheriff’s Out-of-Court Statement to Gregory Palacol Constituted Irrelevant, Inherently Prejudicial and Inadmissible Hearsay Evidence	204
C. The Trial Court’s Error Requires Reversal of the Judgment	209

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
V THE COURT ERRED IN ADMITTING, AS FACTOR (B) EVIDENCE, THE HIGHLY INCRIMINATING HEARSAY TESTIMONY OF DEPUTY THOMAS MOREAN REGARDING AN INCIDENT INVOLVING MUTUAL COMBAT, THEREBY VIOLATING APPELLANT’S RIGHT TO CONFRONTATION AND PREVENTING HIM FROM RECEIVING A FAIR TRIAL AND DUE PROCESS OF LAW IN VIOLATION OF THE SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS	211
A. Procedural and Factual Background	211
B. The Trial Judge Committed Reversible Error In Admitting Morean’s Testimony Regarding the Fight in the Jail Day Room, Which Was Based Almost Entirely Upon Inadmissible Hearsay	215
1. Applicable Legal Principles	215
2. The Trial Court Erred in Admitting Morean’s Testimony	216
a. Morean’s Testimony Was Not Admissible Under Any Exception to the Hearsay Rule	217
b. The Admission of Morean’s Hearsay-Based Testimony Violated Appellant’s Right to Confrontation	220
C. The Admission of Morean’s Testimony Was Unduly Prejudicial	225
VI THE TRIAL COURT’S ADMISSION OF IMPROPER FACTOR (B) EVIDENCE VIOLATED APPELLANT’S RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL BY AN IMPARTIAL JURY, EQUAL PROTECTION, A RELIABLE PENALTY VERDICT, AND TO BE FREE FROM CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT UNDER THE STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS	229
A. Introduction	229
B. Relevant Procedural History	231

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
C. Applicable Legal Principles	234
D. The Trial Court Erred in Admitting Evidence Regarding Appellant's Encounter With Deputy Argandona	235
1. Factual and Procedural Background	235
2. The Evidence Relating to Appellant's Encounter With Deputy Argandona Did Not Demonstrate the Commission of a Criminal Act Within the Meaning of Penal Code Section 190.3, Factor (b)	236
E. The Trial Court Erroneously Admitted Evidence That Appellant Threatened a Witness In An Unrelated Case	240
1. Procedural Background	240
a. In Limine Proceedings	240
b. Evidence Presented at the Penalty Trial	244
2. The Trial Court Erroneously Admitted Evidence That Appellant Threatened a Witness In an Unrelated Case	246
a. The Trial Court's In Limine Ruling Permitting the Prosecutor to Present Evidence Relating to the Purported Threat Was Erroneous Because of the Inadequacy of the Prosecutor's Showing	247
b. The Evidence Relating to Appellant's Purported Threat Did Not Demonstrate That a Criminal Act Had Been Committed	251
F. The Trial Court Erroneously Admitted Evidence Regarding Appellant's June 7, 2005, Confrontation With a Fellow Inmate	252
1. Factual and Procedural Background	252

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
2. The Trial Court Erroneously Admitted Evidence Relating to Appellant's Confrontation with Benjamin Gonzalez Because The Evidence Did Not Demonstrate the Commission of Any Actual Crimes	254
G. The Trial Court Erred in Admitting Evidence That Appellant Possessed An Altered Paper Clip	260
1. Pertinent Factual and Legal Background	260
2. The Trial Court Erroneously Admitted Evidence Relating to Appellant's Possession of the Paper Clip For Lack of Proof That It Was a Handcuff Key or That It Carried An Implied Threat of Violence	261
H. The Trial Court Erred in Admitting Evidence Regarding Appellant's Letter to Ursula Gomez and His Attempt to Smuggle Letters As Legal Mail	264
1. Procedural and Factual Background	264
a. Appellant's Letter to Ursula Gomez	264
b. Evidence That Appellant Had Attempted to Smuggle The Letters Through the Legal Mail	267
c. Rebuttal Evidence Introduced At Trial	267
2. The Trial Court Erroneously Failed to Exclude Evidence Relating to Appellant's Letters Because It Did Not Demonstrate Actual Crimes	270
I. The Trial Court's Error in Admitting the Evidence Was Unduly Prejudicial and Requires Reversal of the Death Judgment	275

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
VII THE TRIAL COURT’S DETERMINATION OF THE ULTIMATE FACTUAL QUESTION WHETHER THE ACTS INTRODUCED PURSUANT TO PENAL CODE SECTION 190.3, FACTOR (B), INVOLVED FORCE OR VIOLENCE OR THE EXPRESS OR IMPLIED THREAT OF FORCE OR VIOLENCE IMPERMISSIBLY INVADED THE EXCLUSIVE FACTFINDING PROVINCE OF THE JURY AND REQUIRES REVERSAL UNDER BOTH THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION AND STATE LAW	282
A. Introduction	282
B. The Instant Argument Is Cognizable on Appeal	285
C. Whether a Crime Involves Force, Violence or Threat is a Factual Question for the Jury, Not a Legal Question for the Court	288
D. The Error in Failing to Submit the Factual Question Whether Appellant’s Acts Involved Force, Violence or Threat Was Prejudicial and Requires Reversal of the Death Verdict	295
VIII CALIFORNIA’S DEATH PENALTY STATUTE, AS INTERPRETED BY THIS COURT AND APPLIED AT APPELLANT’S TRIAL, VIOLATES THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION	301
A. Penal Code Section 190.2 Is Impermissibly Broad	301
B. The Broad Application Of Section 190.3, Subdivision (a) Violated Appellant’s Constitutional Rights	302
C. The Death Penalty Statute And Accompanying Jury Instructions Fail To Set Forth The Appropriate Burden Of Proof	303
1. Appellant’s Death Sentence Is Unconstitutional Because it Is Not Premised on Findings Made Beyond a Reasonable Doubt	303

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
2. Some Burden of Proof Is Required, or the Jury Should Have Been Instructed That There Was No Burden of Proof	306
3. Appellant's Death Verdict Was Not Premised on Unanimous Jury Findings	307
a. Aggravating Factors	307
b. Unadjudicated Criminal Activity	308
4. The Instructions Caused the Penalty Determination to Turn on an Impermissibly Vague and Ambiguous Standard	310
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	310
6. The Instructions Violated the Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments by Failing to Inform the Jury Regarding the Standard of Proof and Lack of Need for Unanimity as to Mitigating Circumstances	311
7. The Penalty Jury Should Be Instructed on the Presumption of Life	313
D. Failing To Require That The Jury Make Written Findings Violates Appellant's Right to Meaningful Appellate Review	314
E. The Instructions To The Jury On Mitigating And Aggravating Factors Violated Appellant's Constitutional Rights	314
1. The Use of Restrictive Adjectives in the List of Potential Mitigating Factors	314
2. The Failure to Delete Inapplicable Sentencing Factors	315

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
3. The Failure to Instruct That Statutory Mitigating Factors Were Relevant Solely as Potential Mitigators	315
F. The Prohibition Against Inter-Case Proportionality Review Guarantees Arbitrary And Disproportionate Impositions Of The Death Penalty	316
G. The California Capital Sentencing Scheme Violates The Equal Protection Clause	316
H. California's Use Of The Death Penalty As A Regular Form Of Punishment Falls Short of International Norms	317
IX REVERSAL IS REQUIRED BASED ON THE CUMULATIVE EFFECT OF ERRORS THAT COLLECTIVELY UNDERMINED THE FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS OF THE TRIAL AND THE RELIABILITY OF THE DEATH JUDGMENT	318
CONCLUSION	322
CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL	323

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

FEDERAL CASES

<i>Adams v. Texas</i> (1980) 448 U.S. 38	107, 108
<i>Apprendi v. New Jersey</i> (2000) 530 U.S. 466	passim
<i>Arizona v. Fulminante</i> (1991) 499 U.S. 279	320
<i>Atkins v. Virginia</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 304	200, 304, 307, 309
<i>Ballew v. Georgia</i> (1978) 435 U.S. 223	307
<i>Beck v. Alabama</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 625	passim
<i>Blakely v. Washington</i> (2004) 542 U.S. 296	304, 305, 309
<i>Boyde v. California</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 370	310, 312
<i>Brewer v. Quarterman</i> (2007) 550 U.S. 286	311
<i>Brinegar v. United States</i> (1949) 338 U.S. 160	199
<i>Bruton v. United States</i> (1968) 391 U.S. 123	passim
<i>Caldwell v. Mississippi</i> (1985) 472 U.S. 320	319, 321

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<i>Carter v. Kentucky</i> (1981) 450 U.S. 288	305
<i>Chambers v. Mississippi</i> (1973) 410 U.S. 284	318
<i>Chapman v. California</i> (1967) 386 U.S. 18	passim
<i>Crawford v. Washington</i> (2004) 541 U.S. 36	220, 222, 224, 226
<i>Cunningham v. California</i> (2007) 549 U.S. 270	309
<i>Darden v. Wainwright</i> (1986) 477 U.S. 168	109
<i>Davis v. Washington</i> (2006) 547 U.S. 813	passim
<i>Dawson v. Delaware</i> (1992) 503 U.S. 159	186
<i>Delo v. Lashley</i> (1983) 507 U.S. 272	313
<i>Donnelly v. DeChristoforo</i> (1974) 416 U.S. 637	318
<i>Duncan v. Louisiana</i> (1968) 391 U.S. 145	106
<i>Duran v. City of Douglas, Ariz.</i> (9th Cir. 1990) 904 F.2d 1372	238

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

<i>Estelle v. McGuire</i> (1991) 502 U.S. 62	199, 209
<i>Estelle v. Williams</i> (1976) 425 U.S. 501	313
<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> (1972) 408 U.S. 238	301
<i>Gall v. Parker</i> (6th Cir. 2000) 231 F.3d 265	130
<i>Garceau v. Woodford</i> (9th Cir. 2001) 275 F.3d 769	169, 170, 250
<i>Gray v. Mississippi</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 648	108, 109, 131, 132
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 153	314
<i>Harmelin v. Michigan</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 957	308
<i>Hitchcock v. Dugger</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 393	320
<i>Hicks v. Oklahoma</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 343	199, 295, 306, 311
<i>In re Winship</i> (1970) 397 U.S. 358	198
<i>Irvin v. Dowd</i> (1961) 366 U.S. 717	106

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<i>Jammal v. Van de Kamp</i> (9th Cir. 1991) 926 F.2d 918	199
<i>Johnson v. Mississippi</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 578	227, 309, 319
<i>Krulewich v. United States</i> (1949) 336 U.S. 440	208
<i>Lockett v. Ohio</i> (1978) 438 U.S. 586	174, 200, 311, 314
<i>Lockhart v. McCree</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 162	107
<i>McKinney v. Rees</i> (9th Cir. 1993) 993 F.2d 1378	169, 170, 176, 199
<i>McKoy v. North Carolina</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 433	307, 312
<i>Maynard v. Cartwright</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 356	303, 310
<i>Michaelson v. United States</i> (1948) 335 U.S. 469	167, 174
<i>Michigan v. Bryant</i> (2011) ___ U.S. ___	220, 223, 224
<i>Mills v. Maryland</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 367	311, 312, 314
<i>Monge v. California</i> (1998) 524 U.S. 721	308

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

<i>Morgan v. Illinois</i> (1992) 504 U.S. 719	106, 107, 108
<i>Myers v. Ylst</i> (9th Cir. 1990) 897 F.2d 417	308
<i>O’Campo v. Vail</i> (9th Cir. 2011) 649 F.3d 1098	225
<i>Ohio v. Roberts</i> (1980) 448 U.S. 56	220
<i>Parle v. Runnels</i> (9th Cir. 2007) 505 F.3d 922	318
<i>Penry v. Lynaugh</i> (1989) 492 U.S. 302	200
<i>Pointer v. Texas</i> (1965) 380 U.S. 400	220
<i>Price v. Superior Court</i> (2001) 25 Cal.4th 1046	108, 190, 241, 305
<i>Pulley v. Harris</i> (1984) 465 U.S. 37	176
<i>Richmond v. Lewis</i> (1992) 506 U.S. 40	281
<i>Ring v. Arizona</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 584	passim
<i>Roper v. Simmons</i> (2005) 543 U.S. 551	317

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<i>Saffle v. Parks</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 484	175, 200, 312
<i>Sandstrom v. Montana</i> (1979) 442 U.S. 510	198
<i>Simmons v. South Carolina</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 154	187
<i>Skipper v. South Carolina</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 1	320
<i>Snowden v. Singletary</i> (11th Cir. 1998) 135 F.3d 732	209
<i>Sochor v. Florida</i> (1992) 504 U.S. 527	227, 281
<i>Stinson v. United States</i> (1993) 508 U.S. 36	291
<i>Stringer v. Black</i> (1992) 503 U.S. 222	316
<i>Sullivan v. Louisiana</i> (1993) 508 U.S. 275	319
<i>Trop v. Dulles</i> (1958) 356 U.S. 86	317
<i>Tuilaepa v. California</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 967	303
<i>Turner v. Murray</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 28	106

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

<i>Turner v. State of Louisiana</i> (1965) 379 U.S. 466	176
<i>United States v. Kelner</i> (2d Cir. 1976) 534 F.2d 1020	274
<i>United States v. McCullough</i> (10th Cir. 1996) 76 F.3d 1087	320
<i>United States v. Merriweather</i> (6th Cir. 1996) 78 F.3d 1070	196
<i>Uttecht v. Brown</i> (2007) 551 U.S. 1	109, 131
<i>Vasquez v. Hillery</i> (1986) 474 U.S. 254	301
<i>Virginia v. Black</i> (2003) 538 U.S. 343	237, 248, 252, 270
<i>Wainwright v. Witt</i> (1985) 469 U.S. 412	passim
<i>Wardius v. Oregon</i> (1973) 412 U.S. 470	311
<i>Wiggins v. Smith</i> (2003) 539 U.S. 510	296
<i>Williamson v. United States</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 594	215
<i>Witherspoon v. Illinois</i> (1968) 391 U.S. 510	passim

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<i>Woodford v. Garceau</i> (2003) 538 U.S. 202	169-170, 269
<i>Woodson v. North Carolina</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 290	307, 311
<i>Zant v. Stephens</i> (1983) 462 U.S. 862	227, 301

STATE CASES

<i>Bowman v. Wyatt</i> (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 286	194
<i>County of Sonoma v. Grant W.</i> (1986) 187 Cal.App.3d 1439	216
<i>Hovey v. Superior Court</i> (1980) 28 Cal.3d 1	110
<i>In re Marquez</i> (1992) 1 Cal.4th 584	320
<i>In re Wing Y.</i> (1977) 67 Cal.App.3d 69	189, 194, 198
<i>People v. Albarran</i> (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 214	186, 192
<i>People v. Albertson</i> (1944) 23 Cal.2d 550	296
<i>People v. Alcala</i> (1984) 36 Cal.3d 604	170, 171, 173
<i>People v. Alvarez</i> (1996) 14 Cal.4th 155	190

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

<i>People v. Anderson</i> (2001) 25 Cal.4th 543	304, 305, 309
<i>People v. Arias</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 92	306, 313
<i>People v. Ashmus</i> (1991) 54 Cal.3d 932	109, 154, 247
<i>People v. Avila</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 491	314
<i>People v. Avitia</i> (2005) 127 Cal.App.4th 185	passim
<i>People v. Bacon</i> (2010) 50 Cal.4th 1082	290
<i>People v. Balcom</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4th 414.	137
<i>People v. Barnwell</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4th 1038	138
<i>People v. Barton</i> (1995) 12 Cal.4th 186	286
<i>People v. Baskett</i> (1965) 237 Cal.App.2d 712	167
<i>People v. Bean</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 919	152-153, 320, 321
<i>People v. Black</i> (2014) 58 Cal.4th 912	128

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<i>People v. Blacksher</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4th 769	224
<i>People v. Bittaker</i> (1989) 48 Cal.3d 1046	128, 129, 315
<i>People v. Blair</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 686	303, 305
<i>People v. Bojorquez</i> (2002) 104 Cal.App.4th 335	186, 187, 193
<i>People v. Bolin</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 297	242, 272, 273, 274
<i>People v. Boyd</i> (1985) 38 Cal.3d 762	234, 247
<i>People v. Boyer</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 412	227
<i>People v. Bradford</i> (1997) 15 Cal.4th 1229	127, 130
<i>People v. Bramit</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 1221	109
<i>People v. Breaux</i> (1991) 1 Cal.4th 281	310
<i>People v. Brown</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 432	passim
<i>People v. Brown</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4th 382	303

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

<i>People v. Cardenas</i> (1982) 31 Cal.3d 897	passim
<i>People v. Carrasco</i> (2014) ___ P.3d ___, 2014 WL 3805476	168
<i>People v. Carter</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 1166	188
<i>People v. Cash</i> (2002) 28 Cal.4th 703	127
<i>People v. Castro</i> (1985) 38 Cal.3d 301	174
<i>People v. Catlin</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4th 81	151, 156, 188
<i>People v. Clair</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 629	247, 251
<i>People v. Clark</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4th 856	123
<i>People v. Coddington</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 529	190
<i>People v. Cole</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 1158	227
<i>People v. Coleman</i> (1985) 38 Cal.3d 69	208
<i>People v. Cook</i> (2006) 39 Cal.4th 566	314, 315, 317

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<i>People v. Coombs</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4th 821	130
<i>People v. Cowan</i> (2010) 50 Cal.4th 401	125, 127, 131
<i>People v. Cox</i> (1991) 53 Cal.3d 618	186, 188, 194, 198
<i>People v. Cox</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 916	167
<i>People v. Crew</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 822	166
<i>People v. Crittenden</i> (1994) 9 Cal.4th 83	150, 194, 198
<i>People v. Cummings</i> (1993) 4 Cal.4th 1233	122
<i>People v. Danielson</i> (1992) 3 Cal.4th 691	241
<i>People v. Davenport</i> (1985) 41 Cal.3d 247	315
<i>People v. Davis</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 510	205, 221, 222
<i>People v. Dellinger</i> (1984) 163 Cal.App.3d 284	196
<i>People v. Demetrulias</i> (2006) 39 Cal.4th 1	passim

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

<i>People v. Dennis</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 468	218
<i>People v. Dollar</i> (1991) 228 Cal.App.3d 1335	259
<i>People v. Doolin</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 390	186
<i>People v. Duarte</i> (2000) 24 Cal.4th 603	215
<i>People v. Duenas</i> (2012) 55 Cal.4th 1	122
<i>People v. Duncan</i> (1991) 53 Cal.3d 955	311
<i>People v. Duran</i> (1976) 16 Cal.3d 282	207
<i>People v. Edelbacher</i> (1989) 47 Cal.3d 983	301
<i>People v. Elliott</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 535	290
<i>People v. Ervin</i> (2000) 22 Cal.4th 48	121
<i>People v. Ewoldt</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4th 380	passim
<i>People v. Fairbank</i> (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1223	304

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<i>People v. Falsetta</i> (1999) 21 Cal.4th 903	170, 171, 173
<i>People v. Fauber</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 792	314
<i>People v. Fierro</i> (1991) 1 Cal.4th 173	316
<i>People v. Filson</i> (1994) 22 Cal.App. 4th 1841	167
<i>People v. Flood</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 470	287
<i>People v. Foster</i> (2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 331	257-258
<i>People v. Foster</i> (2010) 50 Cal.4th 1301	152, 165
<i>People v. Fudge</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4th 1075	121, 122
<i>People v. Fuiava</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 622	220
<i>People v. Gallegos</i> (1974) 39 Cal.App.3d 512	262-263
<i>People v. Garceau</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4th 140	189, 232, 244, 250
<i>People v. Ghent</i> (1987) 43 Cal.3d 739	108, 317

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<i>People v. Gibson</i> (1976) 56 Cal.App.3d 119	196
<i>People v. Gonzales</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 1234	122
<i>People v. Griffin</i> (1967) 66 Cal.2d 459	138
<i>People v. Griffin</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 536	138-139, 207, 305
<i>People v. Guerrero</i> (1976) 16 Cal.3d 719	152, 167
<i>People v. Gurule</i> (2002) 28 Cal.4th 557	188
<i>People v. Gutierrez</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 789	227
<i>People v. Guzman</i> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 915	108, 153, 212, 215
<i>People v. Hamilton</i> (1989) 48 Cal.3d 1142	315
<i>People v. Hamilton</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 863	271, 272, 274
<i>People v. Harris</i> (1981) 28 Cal.3d 935	275
<i>People v. Harris</i> (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 727	136

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<i>People v. Haston</i> (1968) 69 Cal.2d 233	137
<i>People v. Hawthorne</i> (1992) 4 Cal.4th 43	304
<i>People v. Hayes</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 577	319
<i>People v. Hayes</i> (1999) 21 Cal.4th 1211	107, 173
<i>People v. Heard</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 946	132, 150, 204
<i>People v. Hendrix</i> (2013) 214 Cal.App.4th 216	passim
<i>People v. Hernandez</i> (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 225	219
<i>People v. Hernandez</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 1040	188, 192, 219
<i>People v. Hill</i> (1992) 3 Cal.4th 959	127, 130
<i>People v. Hill</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 800	127, 318
<i>People v. Hillhouse</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 469	284, 315
<i>People v. Holt</i> (1984) 37 Cal.3d 436	319

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

<i>People v. Holmes</i> (2012) 212 Cal.App.4th 431	227
<i>People v. Hovarter</i> (2008) 44 Cal.4th 983	152
<i>People v. Johnson</i> (1989) 47 Cal.3d 1194	122
<i>People v. Jones</i> (1997) 15 Cal.4th 119	127
<i>People v. Jones</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 279	287
<i>People v. Kauresh</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 648	131, 247
<i>People v. Kelley</i> (1980) 113 Cal.App.3d 1005	311
<i>People v. Kelly</i> (1990) 51 Cal.3d 931	121
<i>People v. Kennedy</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 595	188, 303, 315
<i>People v. King</i> (1956) 140 Cal.App.2d 1	207
<i>People v. Kipp</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4th 1100	167
<i>People v. Kirkpatrick</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4th 988	130

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<i>People v. Laino</i> (2004) 32 Cal.4th 878	292
<i>People v. Lancaster</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4th 50	262, 263, 265
<i>People v. Lavergne</i> (1971) 4 Cal.3d 735	190, 194
<i>People v. Lee</i> (1990) 219 Cal.App.3d 829	217
<i>People v. Lenart</i> (2004) 32 Cal.4th 1107	306
<i>People v. Lewis</i> (2001) 25 Cal.4th 610	154
<i>People v. Lightsey</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 668	238
<i>People v. Lindberg</i> (2008) 45 Cal.4th 1	154, 274
<i>People v. Livaditis</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 759	216, 247, 251
<i>People v. Livingston</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1145	206, 225
<i>People v. Lopez</i> (1998) 66 Cal.App.4th 615	187
<i>People v. Lowery</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4th 419	passim

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

<i>People v. Lucky</i> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 259	211, 212, 215
<i>People v. Maestas</i> (1993) 20 Cal.App.4th 1482	201
<i>People v. Manriquez</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4th 547	317
<i>People v. Martinez</i> (1995) 11 Cal.4th 434	167
<i>People v. Martinez</i> (2000) 22 Cal.4th 106	216
<i>People v. Martinez</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 673	275
<i>People v. Mason</i> (1991) 52 Cal.3d 909	121
<i>People v. Mayfield</i> (1997) 14 Cal.4th 668	122
<i>People v. McClellan</i> (1969) 71 Cal.2d 793	295
<i>People v. McElroy</i> (2005) 126 Cal.App.4th 874	258
<i>People v. McKinzie</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 1302	122, 127, 208
<i>People v. McLaughlin</i> (1996) 46 Cal.App.4th 836	242, 244

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<i>People v. Medina</i> (1995) 11 Cal.4th 694	308
<i>People v. Melton</i> (1988) 44 Cal.3d 713	249
<i>People v. Michaels</i> (2002) 28 Cal.4th 486	290
<i>People v. Mitcham</i> (1992) 1 Cal.4th 1027	122
<i>People v. Montiel</i> (1993) 5 Cal.4th 877	248, 249
<i>People v. Moore</i> (1954) 43 Cal.2d 517	311
<i>People v. Moore</i> (2011) 51 Cal.4th 1104	215
<i>People v. Morris</i> (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 363	224
<i>People v. Murphy</i> (1963) 59 Cal.2d 818	190
<i>People v. Murtishaw</i> (1981) 29 Cal.3d 733	234
<i>People v. Nakahara</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 705	passim
<i>People v. Navarro</i> (2013) 212 Cal.App.4th 1336	257

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<i>People v. Ochoa</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4th 398	passim
<i>People v. Parker</i> (1992) 8 Cal.App.4th 110	216, 219
<i>People v. Parks</i> (1971) 4 Cal.3d 955	218
<i>People v. Partida</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4th 428	passim
<i>People v. Pensinger</i> (1991) 52 Cal.3d 1210	239
<i>People v. Perez</i> (1979) 23 Cal.3d 545	287
<i>People v. Perez</i> (1981) 114 Cal.App.3d 470	186, 189
<i>People v. Phillips</i> (1985) 41 Cal.3d 29	passim
<i>People v. Polk</i> (1965) 63 Cal.2d 443	295
<i>People v. Pride</i> (1992) 3 Cal.4th 195	168
<i>People v. Prieto</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 226	293, 305, 307, 308
<i>People v. Quartermain</i> (1997) 16 Cal.4th 600	290