

# SUPREME COURT COPY

COPY

No. S153881

## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE,  
  
Plaintiff and Respondent,  
  
v.  
  
CUITLAHUAC TAHUA RIVERA,  
  
Defendant and Appellant.

Colusa County Superior Court  
  
Case No. CR 46819  
  
Hon. S. William Abel, Judge  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
  
Automatic Appeal From A  
Judgment and Sentence of Death

---

**Appellant Cuitlahuac Tahua Rivera's Opening Brief**

---

SUPREME COURT  
**FILED**

JAN 29 2015

Frank A. McGuire Clerk  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy

Stephen M. Lathrop (Cal. Bar No. 126813)  
Certified Appellate Law Specialist  
State Bar of Cal. Board of Legal Specialization  
904 Silver Spur Rd. #430, Rolling Hills Est., CA 90274  
Email: stephen.lathrop@cox.net  
Tel. (310) 237-1000, ext. 3; Fax (310) 237-1010

Attorney for Defendant/Appellant  
Cuitlahuac Tahua Rivera

# DEATH PENALTY



## Topical Index

	Page
Statement of the Judgment.....	1
Introduction. ....	2
Statement of Appealability.....	7
Statement of the Case.....	7
Statement of Facts.....	11
A.    Guilt phase—the prosecution’s case.....	11
(1)    Introduction. ....	11
(2)    The McIntire/Bianchi shooting on April 11, 2004, counts 3 through 7. ....	12
(3)    The shooting of Officer Gray on April 15, 2004, counts 1 and 2.....	14
(a)    The traffic stop. ....	14
(b)    Prior contact with Officer Gray.....	15
(c)    The shooting—eyewitness testimony. ....	16
(d)    The scene of the shooting and search of the area. ....	19
(e)    Appellant’s movements near the scene of the shooting. ....	21
(f)    Travel to San Diego and subsequent arrest in Merced.....	23
(g)    Autopsy. ....	25

	(h) Police investigation and stipulations.....	26
(4)	Appellant’s interview by the police and out-of-court statements. ....	27
(5)	Gang testimony and appellant’s affiliation with the MGC gang. ....	29
(6)	Prior uncharged misconduct.....	31
(7)	Appellant’s prior felony convictions. ....	33
B.	Guilt phase–defense evidence. ....	33
	(1) The shooting of Officer Gray was not gang-related. ....	33
	(2) Impeachment of eyewitnesses to the McIntire/Bianchi shooting. ....	34
C.	Guilt phase–the prosecution’s rebuttal case. ....	35
D.	Penalty phase–the prosecution’s case. ....	36
	(1) Prior felony convictions. ....	36
	(2) Juvenile adjudications.....	36
	(3) Other crimes evidence. ....	37
	(4) Victim impact. ....	37
E.	Penalty phase–defense evidence. ....	41
	(1) Clinical assessment of mental health issues adversely affecting appellant. ....	41
	(2) Character witnesses. ....	43

Argument.....	45
Guilt Phase and Special Circumstance Issues.....	45
1. The evidence is insufficient as a matter of law to sustain the finding that appellant committed the murder in count 1 with premeditation and deliberation, requiring reduction of the offense to second degree murder.....	45
A. Introduction and summary of argument.....	45
B. Standard of review.....	46
C. The prosecution failed to sustain its burden of proving that appellant committed the murder with premeditation and deliberation.....	48
2. The trial court prejudicially erred by giving a flawed version of CALJIC No. 8.71 regarding consideration of second degree murder, requiring reduction of the offense in count 1 to second degree murder.....	56
A. Introduction.....	56
B. Standard of review.....	57
C. The issue is cognizable on appeal.....	57
D. The trial court erred by giving a flawed version of CALJIC No. 8.71 regarding consideration of second degree murder.....	59
E. The instructional error was prejudicial because it lowered the prosecution's burden of proof by making first degree murder the de facto default finding and it deprived appellant of the assurance that the jurors unanimously found that the prosecution proved, beyond a reasonable doubt, every fact necessary to constitute the crime of first degree murder, requiring reduction of appellant's conviction in count 1 to second degree murder.....	61

3.	The trial court prejudicially erred by giving an acquittal-first instruction on count 1, requiring reduction of the offense to second degree murder. . . . .	67
A.	Introduction. . . . .	67
B.	Standard of review. . . . .	68
C.	Requiring a capital case jury to unanimously acquit on the greater offense before being permitted to convict of a lesser included offense violates due process, the right to jury trial, and Eighth Amendment guarantees. . . . .	68
D.	Reduction of the offense to second degree murder is required for structural error; alternatively, the prosecution will be unable to prove that the instructional error was harmless beyond a reasonable doubt because the evidence does not necessarily support a conviction for the greater offense of first degree murder. . . . .	73
4.	The trial court prejudicially erred in failing to instruct that subjective provocation may reduce premeditated first degree murder to second degree murder, requiring reduction of the offense in count 1 to second degree murder. . . . .	76
A.	Introduction and summary of argument. . . . .	76
B.	The issue is cognizable on appeal. . . . .	77
C.	The trial court erred by failing to instruct that subjective provocation can reduce premeditated murder to second degree murder. . . . .	80
D.	The instructional error denied appellant the constitutional rights of jury trial and due process, and resulted in prejudicial error requiring reduction of appellant's conviction on count 1 to second degree murder because appellant presented substantial, persuasive evidence of provocation based on a subjective standard. . . . .	84

5.	The jury was instructed on an invalid theory in connection with the special circumstance allegation of murder to prevent arrest or escape from lawful custody (Pen. Code, § 190.2, subd. (a)(5)), requiring that the true finding thereon be vacated. . . . .	89
	A. Introduction. . . . .	89
	B. Standard of review. . . . .	89
	C. The issue is cognizable on appeal. . . . .	90
	D. Escape from lawful custody is an invalid theory because appellant was not in custody. . . . .	90
	E. The prosecution will be unable to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the jury based the true finding on a valid theory, requiring that the true finding thereon be vacated. . . . .	92
6.	The peace-officer-killing special finding on count 1 must be stricken because it does not apply to a conviction for first degree murder. . . . .	101
7.	The true findings on the gang enhancement in counts 1 and 2—murder and unlawful possession of a firearm—must be reversed because the evidence is insufficient to prove that the shooting of Gray was both gang related and committed with the specific intent to promote, further, or assist in any criminal conduct by gang members. . . . .	104
	A. Introduction and summary of argument. . . . .	104
	B. Standard of review. . . . .	106
	C. The evidence is insufficient to sustain the gang enhancement true findings in connection with the murder of Gray and accompanying possession of a firearm, counts 1 and 2, respectively. . . . .	107

(1)	The evidence is insufficient to sustain a finding that the offenses were gang related. . . . .	109
(i)	The prosecution failed to adduce sufficient evidence that the shooting was committed by appellant to “benefit” the gang. . . . .	109
(ii)	The prosecution failed to adduce sufficient evidence that the shooting was committed by appellant in association with the gang or at the direction of its members. . . . .	115
(2)	The evidence is insufficient to sustain a finding that the offenses were committed with the specific intent to promote, further, or assist in any criminal conduct by gang members. . . . .	117
8.	The trial court failed to instruct the jury on all of the elements of assault for purposes of the offense of assault with a semiautomatic firearm on McIntire and Bianchi, requiring reversal of counts 5 and 6. . . . .	122
A.	Introduction. . . . .	122
B.	Standard of review. . . . .	124
C.	The issue is cognizable on appeal. . . . .	124
D.	The failure to define the elements of assault for purposes of the offense of assault with a semiautomatic firearm violated appellant’s constitutional rights. . . . .	125
E.	Reversal of appellant’s convictions on counts 5 and 6 is required for structural error; alternatively, reversal is required under the constitutional standard. . . . .	127
9.	The prosecutor committed egregious misconduct during guilt-phase closing argument, requiring reversal of appellant’s convictions for a violation of the constitutional rights to due	



process, effective assistance of counsel, and a fundamentally fair jury trial.. . . . .	131
A. Introduction, procedural background, and summary of argument. . . . .	131
B. Standard of review.. . . . .	135
C. The prosecutor committed egregious misconduct during guilt-phase closing argument.. . . . .	135
(1) The prosecutor committed misconduct by arguing the existence of facts not admitted into evidence to bolster the prosecution’s case.. . . . .	137
(2) The prosecutor committed misconduct by vouching for the witnesses, which bolstered the testimony in support of the prosecution’s case. . . . .	139
(3) The prosecutor committed misconduct by appealing to passion and fear. . . . .	140
(4) The prosecutor committed misconduct by misstating the law on first degree premeditated murder.. . . . .	143
(5) The prosecutor committed misconduct by suggesting unethical conduct by the defense expert witness. . . . .	145
D. The egregious misconduct warrants reversal of appellant’s convictions because the error cannot be proven harmless beyond a reasonable doubt and it is reasonably probable that a more favorable result would have been reached absent the error. . . . .	147
10. Appellant requests review of the sealed transcripts of the trial court’s <i>Pitchess</i> hearings and a determination of whether the trial court improperly withheld relevant documents from the personnel file of Officer Stephan Gray.. . . . .	151

A.	Introduction and procedural background.....	151
(1)	The original motion. ....	151
(2)	The amended motion, <i>Pitchess</i> hearing, and first in camera review.....	154
(3)	The City of Merced’s request to reopen the in camera review, and the second in camera review. . .	155
B.	Request for independent review of the sealed transcript of the trial court’s in camera <i>Pitchess</i> hearings on June 6 and August 30, 2005.....	157
(1)	Request for review whether the trial court’s in camera hearings complied with applicable law. ....	159
(2)	Request for review whether the trial court abused its discretion by denying, in part, disclosure of information.....	160
11.	The trial court prejudicially erred in admitting irrelevant, highly prejudicial evidence of appellant’s uncharged conduct involving Mohammed, Gonzalez and Bradley several years prior to the instant offenses, requiring reversal of appellant’s convictions.....	161
A.	Introduction and procedural background.....	161
B.	Standard of review.....	165
C.	Appellant’s prior uncharged misconduct involving use of a firearm.....	165
(1)	Incident involving Mohammed and Gonzalez in 2000 or 2001.....	165
(2)	Incident involving Bradley in September 2000. ....	166
D.	The admission of the extensive evidence of appellant’s uncharged misconduct involving use of a firearm years	

	before the charged offenses constituted an abuse of discretion under state evidentiary rules. . . . .	167
E.	The admission of damaging evidence of appellant’s prior firearm use violated due process and deprived appellant of a fundamentally fair trial, requiring reversal of his convictions. . . . .	173
12.	The cumulative effect of the guilt phase errors requires reversal of appellant’s convictions for a denial of the constitutional rights to due process and a fair and reliable jury trial. . . . .	178
	Penalty Phase and Sentencing Issues. . . . .	184
13.	The trial court erroneously admitted evidence that appellant sustained juvenile adjudications and was committed a ward of the juvenile court at ages 15 and 16, requiring reversal of the death judgment. . . . .	184
A.	Introduction and procedural background. . . . .	184
B.	The trial court erroneously admitted evidence that appellant sustained juvenile adjudications and was committed a ward of the juvenile court. . . . .	186
C.	Evidence of appellant’s juvenile adjudications and wardship impermissibly lowered the prosecution’s burden of proof and was insufficient as a matter of law to prove the requisite criminal activity. . . . .	187
D.	In view of evolving standards in Eighth Amendment jurisprudence, the jury’s consideration of appellant’s prior juvenile record requires reversal of the death judgment for a violation of the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments. . . . .	190
E.	The death judgment must be reversed because the prosecution will be unable to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that evidence of appellant’s juvenile adjudications and wardship did not contribute to the verdict. . . . .	197

14.	The trial court prejudicially erred by admitting appellant’s postcrime statement that he was unfairly being held in isolation in the Merced County jail because “some pig got killed,” requiring reversal of the death judgment. . . . .	202
A.	Introduction and procedural background. . . . .	202
B.	The statement was erroneously admitted because it was irrelevant to any statutory sentencing factor and the probative value, if any, was substantially outweighed by the prejudicial nature of the evidence, thereby violating state law and depriving appellant of the constitutional rights to due process and a fundamentally fair sentencing determination. . . . .	204
C.	The prosecution will be unable to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the error in admitting the statement did not affect the verdict because the prosecution used the statement to secure the death verdict and the jury requested readback of the statement during deliberations, reflecting that the statement impacted the verdict. . . . .	210
15.	The trial court prejudicially erred by permitting the prosecution to introduce inadmissible testimony in aggravation that while in pretrial confinement appellant caused a disturbance by flooding his cell. . . . .	218
A.	Introduction. . . . .	218
B.	The trial court prejudicially erred in permitting the prosecutor to elicit testimony from Sergeant Carbonaro that was inadmissible in aggravation. . . . .	220
C.	The error in admitting Sergeant Carbonaro’s testimony about the disturbance caused by appellant when he flooded his jail cell with water from the toilet and had be physically extracted from the cell cannot be proven harmless beyond a reasonable doubt. . . . .	222

16.	The death judgment must be reversed because the jury’s use of an invalid sentencing factor—the special circumstance allegation of murder to prevent arrest or escape from lawful custody—rendered the sentence unconstitutional.....	225
17.	The trial court’s refusal to instruct on lingering doubt violated appellant’s constitutional rights, requiring reversal of the death judgment.....	230
18.	California’s death-penalty statute, as interpreted by this Court and applied at appellant’s trial, violates the United States Constitution and international law.....	237
A.	The broad application of section 190.3, factor (a), violated appellant’s constitutional rights.....	237
B.	The death-penalty statute and accompanying jury instructions fail to set forth the appropriate burden of proof.....	239
(1)	Appellant’s death sentence is unconstitutional because it is not premised on findings made beyond a reasonable doubt.....	239
(2)	Some burden of proof is required, or the jury should have been instructed that there was no burden of proof.....	242
(3)	Appellant’s death verdict was not premised on unanimous jury findings.....	243
(4)	The instructions caused the penalty determination to turn on an impermissibly vague and ambiguous standard.....	245
(5)	The instructions failed to inform the jury that the central determination is whether death is the appropriate punishment.....	246

(6)	The penalty jury should be instructed on the presumption of life. . . . .	247
C.	The instructions to the jury on mitigating and aggravating factors violated appellant’s constitutional rights. . . . .	248
D.	The prohibition against inter-case proportionality review guarantees arbitrary and disproportionate impositions of the death penalty. . . . .	248
E.	California’s capital-sentencing scheme violates the Equal Protection Clause. . . . .	249
F.	California’s use of the death penalty as a regular form of punishment falls short of international norms. . . . .	250
G.	The cumulative impact of the deficiencies in California’s capital sentencing scheme render California’s death penalty law constitutionally infirm. . . . .	252
19.	The errors in this case in both the guilt and penalty phases of trial, individually and cumulatively, or in any combination thereof, require reversal of the death judgment for a violation of the state and federal Constitutions. . . . .	253
	Conclusion . . . . .	259
	Certificate of Compliance. . . . .	259

///

## Table of Authorities

	Page(s)
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>Abul-kabir v. Quarterman</i> (2007) 550 U.S. 233. ....	233
<i>Apprendi v. New Jersey</i> (2000) 530 U.S. 466. ....	62, 93, 238, 239, 240
<i>Arizona v. Fulminante</i> (1991) 499 U.S. 279. ....	passim
<i>Atkins v. Virginia</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 304. ....	249
<i>Ballew v. Georgia</i> (1978) 435 U.S. 223. ....	242
<i>Beck v. Alabama</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 625. ....	passim
<i>Berger v. United States</i> (1934) 295 U.S. 78. ....	136
<i>Blystone v. Pennsylvania</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 299. ....	245
<i>Bollenbach v. United States</i> (1946) 326 U.S. 607. ....	61, 87, 92
<i>Boyde v. California</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 370. ....	233
<i>Bradley v. Duncan</i> (9th Cir. 2002) 315 F.3d 1091. ....	230
<i>Brewer v. Quarterman</i> (2007) 550 U.S. 286. ....	230, 233

<i>Briceno v. Scribner</i> (9th Cir. 2009) 555 F.3d 1069. ....	114
<i>Brown v. Sanders</i> (2006) 546 U.S. 212. ....	224, 225, 226, 227, 228
<i>Burger v. Kemp</i> (1987) 483 U.S. 76. ....	passim
<i>Caldwell v. Mississippi</i> (1985) 472 U.S. 320. ....	257
<i>California v. Beheler</i> (1983) 463 U.S. 1121. ....	98
<i>California v. Brown</i> (1987) 479 U.S. 538. ....	229
<i>California v. Green</i> (1970) 399 U.S. 149. ....	174
<i>California v. Hodari D.</i> (1991) 499 U.S. 621. ....	92, 96
<i>California v. Roy</i> (1996) 519 U.S. 2. ....	94
<i>California v. Trombetta</i> (1984) 467 U.S. 479. ....	230
<i>California v. Velasquez</i> (1980) 448 U.S. 903.....	48
<i>Carella v. California</i> (1989) 491 U.S. 263. ....	62, 78, 92
<i>Carter v. Kentucky</i> (1981) 450 U.S. 288. ....	61, 230, 239



<i>Catches v. United States</i> (8th Cir. 1978) 582 F.2d 453. ....	71
<i>Chambers v. Mississippi</i> (1973) 410 U.S. 284. ....	passim
<i>Chapman v. California</i> (1967) 386 U.S. 18. ....	passim
<i>Clay v. American Tobacco Co.</i> (S.D. Ill. 1999) 188 F.R.D. 483.. ....	195
<i>Cooper v. Sowders</i> (6th Cir. 1988) 837 F.2d 284. ....	179
<i>Cunningham v. California</i> (2007) 549 U.S. 270. ....	239, 240
<i>Darden v. Wainwright</i> (1986) 477 U.S. 168. ....	145, 147
<i>Dawson v. Delaware</i> (1992) 503 U.S. 159. ....	208
<i>Delo v. Lashley</i> (1993) 507 U.S. 272.. ....	246
<i>Depetris v. Kuykendall</i> (9th Cir. 2001) 239 F.3d 1057. ....	6, 200, 212
<i>Donnelly v. DeChristoforo</i> (1974) 416 U.S. 637. ....	107, 208
<i>Eddings v. Oklahoma</i> (1982) 455 U.S. 104. ....	196
<i>Enmund v. Florida</i> (1982) 458 U.S. 782. ....	249

<i>Estelle v. McGuire</i> (1991) 502 U.S. 62. ....	126, 208, 230
<i>Estelle v. Williams</i> (1976) 425 U.S. 501. ....	230, 246
<i>Fetterly v. Paskett</i> (9th Cir. 1991) 997 F.2d 1295. ....	231
<i>Gerlaugh v. Stewart</i> (9th Cir. 1997) 129 F.3d 1027. ....	178
<i>Gilmore v. Taylor</i> (1993) 508 U.S. 333. ....	48, 75, 130, 216, 244
<i>Graham v. Florida</i> (2010) 560 U.S. 48. ....	passim
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 153.....	232
<i>Griffin v. United States</i> (1991) 502 U.S. 46. ....	96
<i>Harmelin v. Michigan</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 957. ....	243
<i>Hawkins v. United States</i> (1954) 358 U.S. 74. ....	180
<i>Hedgpeth v. Pulido</i> (2008) 555 U.S. 57. ....	129
<i>Hicks v. Oklahoma</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 343. ....	189, 231, 241
<i>Hitchcock v. Dugger</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 393. ....	233

<i>In re Winship</i> (1970) 397 U.S. 358. ....	passim
<i>Jackson v. Virginia</i> (1979) 443 U.S. 307. ....	passim
<i>Jammal v. Van de Kamp</i> (9th Cir. 1991) 926 F.2d 918. ....	208
<i>Keating v. Hood</i> (9th Cir. 1999) 191 F.3d 1053. ....	95, 100
<i>Keeble v. United States</i> (1973) 412 U.S. 205. ....	69
<i>Kelly v. South Carolina</i> (2002) 534 U.S. 246. ....	90
<i>Krulewitch v. United States</i> (1949) 336 U.S. 440. ....	180
<i>Kyles v. Whitley</i> (1995) 514 U.S. 419. ....	passim
<i>Lincoln v. Sunn</i> (9th Cir. 1987) 807 F.2d 805. ....	179
<i>Lockett v. Ohio</i> (1978) 438 U.S. 586. ....	233
<i>Lorillard Tobacco Co. v. Reilly</i> (2001) 533 U.S. 525. ....	195
<i>Mak v. Blodgett</i> (9th Cir. 1992) 970 F.2d 614. ....	252
<i>Maynard v. Cartwright</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 356. ....	237, 245

<i>McDowell v. Calderon</i> (9th Cir. 1997) 130 F.3d 833. ....	87
<i>McKinney v. Rees</i> (9th Cir. 1993) 993 F.2d 1378. ....	176, 208
<i>McKoy v. North Carolina</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 433. ....	243
<i>Medina v. California</i> (1992) 505 U.S. 437.....	174
<i>Michelson v. United States</i> (1948) 335 U.S. 469. ....	176
<i>Middleton v. McNeil</i> (2004) 541 U.S. 433. ....	59
<i>Miller v. Alabama</i> (2012) 132 S.Ct. 2455.....	190, 192, 193, 196
<i>Mills v. Maryland</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 367. ....	95, 245
<i>Monge v. California</i> (1998) 524 U.S. 721. ....	243
<i>Montana v. Egelhoff</i> (1996) 518 U.S. 37. ....	178, 252
<i>Myers v. Ylst</i> (9th Cir. 1990) 897 F.2d 417. ....	243
<i>Neder v. United States</i> (1999) 527 U.S. 1. ....	126, 127, 129
<i>Ohio v. Roberts</i> (1980) 448 U.S. 56. ....	174

<i>Parle v. Runnels</i> (9th Cir. 2007) 505 F.3d 922. ....	178, 180, 252
<i>Payne v. Tennessee</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 808. ....	253
<i>Penry v. Johnson</i> (2001) 532 U.S. 782. ....	233
<i>Penry v. Lynaugh</i> (1989) 492 U.S. 302. ....	229, 233
<i>Phillips v. Woodford</i> (9th Cir. 2001) 267 F.3d 966. ....	252
<i>Pulley v. Harris</i> (1984) 465 U.S. 37. ....	248
<i>Reagan v. United States</i> (1895) 157 U.S. 301. ....	73
<i>Reno v. Flores</i> (1993) 507 U.S. 292. ....	174
<i>Ring v. Arizona</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 584. ....	238, 243
<i>Roper v. Simmons</i> (2005) 543 U.S. 551. ....	passim
<i>Rose v. Clark</i> (1986) 478 U.S. 570. ....	62, 78, 92
<i>Sandstrom v. Montana</i> (1979) 442 U.S. 510. ....	188
<i>Spencer v. Texas</i> (1967) 385 U.S. 554. ....	175

<i>Sullivan v. Louisiana</i> (1993) 508 U.S. 275. ....	passim
<i>Taylor v. Kentucky</i> (1978) 436 U.S. 478. ....	178, 251, 252
<i>Thompson v. City of Louisville</i> (1960) 362 U.S. 199. ....	107, 173
<i>Trop v. Dulles</i> (1958) 356 U.S. 86. ....	194, 249
<i>Tuilaepa v. California</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 967. ....	237
<i>United States v. Duncan</i> (6th Cir. 1988) 850 F.2d 1104. ....	235
<i>United States v. Echeverry</i> (9th Cir. 1983) 698 F.2d 375. ....	62
<i>United States v. Edmonds</i> (3d Cir. 1996) 80 F.3d 810. ....	66
<i>United States v. Francis</i> (6th Cir. 1999) 170 F.3d 546. ....	138
<i>United States v. Frega</i> (9th Cir. 1999) 179 F.3d 793. ....	61
<i>United States v. Gaudin</i> (1995) 515 U.S. 506. ....	62, 78, 93
<i>United States v. Gordon</i> (9th Cir. 1988) 844 F.2d 1397. ....	62
<i>United States v. Jackson</i> (9th Cir. 1984) 726 F.2d 1466. ....	70, 71

<i>United States v. Molina</i> (9th Cir. 1991) 934 F.2d 1440. ....	138
<i>United States v. Roberts</i> (1st Cir. 1997) 119 F.3d 1006. ....	144
<i>United States v. Russell</i> (3d. Cir. 1998) 134 F.3d 171. ....	66
<i>United States v. Sanchez</i> (9th Cir. 2011) 659 F.3d 1252. ....	140, 142
<i>United States v. Tsanas</i> (2nd Cir. 1978) 572 F.2d 340. ....	70
<i>United States v. Vizcarra-Martinez</i> (9th Cir. 1995) 66 F.3d 1006. ....	176
<i>United States v. Wallace</i> (9th Cir. 1988) 848 F.2d 1464. ....	178
<i>United States v. Weatherspoon</i> (9th Cir. 2005) 410 F.3d 1142. ....	140, 142
<i>Vasquez v. Hillery</i> (1986) 474 U.S. 254. ....	236
<i>White v. Illinois</i> (1992) 502 U.S. 346. ....	107
<i>Woodson v. North Carolina</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 280. ....	208, 242, 245, 253
<i>Workman v. Bell</i> (6th Cir. 1998) 160 F.3d 276. ....	91
<i>Wright v. United States</i> (9th Cir. 1964) 339 F.2d 578. ....	235

<i>Yates v. Evatt</i> (1991) 500 U.S. 391. ....	85
--	----

**State Cases**

<i>Abatti v. Superior Court</i> (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 39. ....	158
--	-----

<i>Cantrell v. State</i> (GA 1996) 469 S.E.2d 660.....	70, 71
---	--------

<i>Houge v. Ford</i> (1955) 44 Cal.2d 706.....	96
---	----

<i>In re Bower</i> (1985) 38 Cal.3d 865.....	88
---	----

<i>In re Carpenter</i> (1995) 9 Cal.4th 634. ....	197
--	-----

<i>In re Ferguson</i> (1971) 5 Cal.3d 525.....	136
---	-----

<i>In re Frank S.</i> (2006) 141 Cal.App.4th 1192. ....	114, 118, 119, 120
--	--------------------

<i>In re Marquez</i> (1992) 1 Cal.4th 584. ....	253
--	-----

<i>In re Tony C.</i> (1978) 21 Cal.3d 888.....	97, 98
---	--------

<i>Kuhn v. Department of General Services</i> (1994) 22 Cal.App.4th 1627. ....	111
---	-----

<i>Louis &amp; Diederich, Inc. v. Cambridge European Imports, Inc.</i> (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 1574.....	111
---	-----

<i>People v. Albillar</i> (2010) 51 Cal.4th 47. ....	passim
---	--------



<i>People v. Alcala</i> (1984) 36 Cal.3d 604.....	173
<i>People v. Andersen</i> (1994) 26 Cal.App.4th 1241. ....	79
<i>People v. Anderson</i> (1968) 70 Cal.2d 15.....	passim
<i>People v. Aranda</i> (2012) 55 Cal.4th 342. ....	65, 74
<i>People v. Ashmus</i> (1991) 54 Cal.3d 932.....	136
<i>People v. Baca</i> (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1703. ....	79
<i>People v. Bacigalupo</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4th 457. ....	245
<i>People v. Barnett</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 1044. ....	169, 206
<i>People v. Barton</i> (1995) 12 Cal.4th 186. ....	125
<i>People v. Bassett</i> (1968) 69 Cal.2d 122.....	113
<i>People v. Bean</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 919.....	55
<i>People v. Benson</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 754.....	136
<i>People v. Berti</i> (1960) 178 Cal.App.2d 872.....	111

<i>People v. Bigelow</i> (1984) 37 Cal.3d 731.....	91, 96
<i>People v. Bittaker</i> (1989) 48 Cal.3d 1046.....	197
<i>People v. Blair</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 686. ....	237, 240
<i>People v. Blakeley</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 82. ....	73
<i>People v. Bolton</i> (1979) 23 Cal.3d 208.....	137
<i>People v. Bonin</i> (1989) 47 Cal.3d 808.....	197
<i>People v. Bowers</i> (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 722. ....	223
<i>People v. Boyd</i> (1985) 38 Cal.3d 762.....	passim
<i>People v. Boyette</i> (2002) 29 Cal.4th 381. ....	144
<i>People v. Brady</i> (1987) 190 Cal.App.3d 124.....	200, 212
<i>People v. Breaux</i> (1991) 1 Cal.4th 281. ....	245
<i>People v. Breverman</i> (1998) 19 Cal.4th 142. ....	57, 58, 83
<i>People v. Brown</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 518. ....	passim

<i>People v. Burton</i> (1989) 48 Cal.3d 843.....	187
<i>People v. Butler</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 847. ....	248
<i>People v. Cahill</i> (1993) 5 Cal.4th 478. ....	73, 136, 143, 252
<i>People v. Caldwell</i> (1965) 43 Cal.2d 864.....	53, 54, 76
<i>People v. Carpenter</i> (1997) 15 Cal.4th 312. ....	170
<i>People v. Carter</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 1114. ....	167, 168
<i>People v. Cash</i> (2002) 28 Cal.4th 703. ....	145
<i>People v. Castaneda</i> (2011) 51 Cal.4th 1292. ....	130
<i>People v. Champion</i> (1995) 9 Cal.4th 879. ....	169
<i>People v. Chiu</i> (2014) 59 Cal.4th 155. ....	144
<i>People v. Chun</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 1172. ....	94, 95, 129
<i>People v. Cleveland</i> (2004) 32 Cal.4th 704. ....	57
<i>People v. Coffman and Marlow</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4th 1. ....	203, 204

<i>People v. Cole</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 1158. ....	passim
<i>People v. Collins</i> (1968) 68 Cal.2d 319.....	85, 179
<i>People v. Combs</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4th 821. ....	186
<i>People v. Contreras</i> (2013) 58 Cal.4th 123. ....	205
<i>People v. Cook</i> (2006) 39 Cal.4th 566. ....	135, 247, 249
<i>People v. Cowan</i> (2010) 50 Cal.4th 401. ....	209
<i>People v. Cox</i> (1991) 53 Cal.3d 618.....	231
<i>People v. Cruz</i> (2008) 44 Cal.4th 636. ....	91, 96
<i>People v. Cudjo</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4th 585. ....	139, 169, 206
<i>People v. Cummings</i> (1993) 4 Cal.4th 1233. ....	127, 128
<i>People v. Dabb</i> (1948) 32 Cal.2d 491.....	205
<i>People v. Daniels</i> (1991) 52 Cal.3d 815.....	173
<i>People v. Davenport</i> (1985) 41 Cal.3d 247.....	187

<i>People v. Delgado</i> (1973) 32 Cal.App.3d 242.....	170, 206
<i>People v. Diaz</i> (1978) 22 Cal.3d 712.....	91, 96
<i>People v. Doolin</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 390. ....	149
<i>People v. Earp</i> (1999) 20 Cal.4th 826. ....	58, 77
<i>People v. Ewoldt</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4th 380. ....	169, 170
<i>People v. Fairbank</i> (1998) 16 Cal.4th 1223. ....	238
<i>People v. Falsetta</i> (1999) 21 Cal.4th 903. ....	172
<i>People v. Fauber</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 792. ....	231
<i>People v. Fields</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 289. ....	68, 246
<i>People v. Fierro</i> (1991) 1 Cal.4th 173. ....	248
<i>People v. Fitzpatrick</i> (1992) 2 Cal.App.4th 1285. ....	80
<i>People v. Flood</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 470. ....	58, 62, 93, 125, 127
<i>People v. Frazier</i> (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 30. ....	199, 212

<i>People v. Friend</i> (2009) 47 Cal.4th 1. ....	147
<i>People v. Fudge</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4th 1075. ....	58
<i>People v. Gaines</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 172. ....	159
<i>People v. Gallego</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 115.....	219
<i>People v. Galvez</i> (2011) 195 Cal.App.4th 1253. ....	117
<i>People v. Gamache</i> (2010) 48 Cal.4th 347. ....	79, 135
<i>People v. Garcia</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4th 706. ....	251
<i>People v. Gardeley</i> (1996) 14 Cal.4th 605. ....	108, 109
<i>People v. Ghent</i> (1987) 43 Cal.3d 739.....	249
<i>People v. Gonzales</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 1234. ....	135
<i>People v. Gonzalez</i> (1990) 51 Cal.3d 1179.....	203, 204
<i>People v. Gonzalez</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 745. ....	78
<i>People v. Green</i> (1980) 27 Cal.3d 1.....	93, 170, 173, 206

<i>People v. Greer</i> (1947) 30 Cal.2d 589.....	102
<i>People v. Griffin</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 536. ....	239
<i>People v. Guerra</i> (2006) 37 Cal.4th 1067. ....	204
<i>People v. Guerrero</i> (1976) 16 Cal.3d 719.....	175
<i>People v. Guiton</i> (1993) 4 Cal.4th 1116. ....	93, 94, 98, 128
<i>People v. Guzman</i> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 915.....	199, 211
<i>People v. Halvorsen</i> (2007) 42 Cal.4th 379. ....	102
<i>People v. Hamilton</i> (1963) 60 Cal.2d 105.....	253
<i>People v. Hawthorne</i> (1992) 4 Cal.4th 43. ....	238
<i>People v. Hayes</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 577.....	185
<i>People v. Hendricks</i> (1987) 43 Cal.3d 584.....	198
<i>People v. Hernandez</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 194.....	63
<i>People v. Herring</i> (1993) 20 Cal.App.4th 1066. ....	137, 239, 240, 243

<i>People v. Hill</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 800. ....	178
<i>People v. Houston</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 1186. ....	57, 68, 90, 124
<i>People v. Hovey</i> (1988) 44 Cal.3d 543. ....	50, 52
<i>People v. Hudson</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 1002. ....	125
<i>People v. Huggins</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 175. ....	143
<i>People v. Hughes</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 287. ....	158
<i>People v. Jackson</i> (1954) 42 Cal.2d 540. ....	97
<i>People v. Jackson</i> (2014) 58 Cal.4th 724. ....	204
<i>People v. Johnson</i> (1980) 26 Cal.3d 557. ....	47, 158
<i>People v. Kelley</i> (1967) 66 Cal.2d 232. ....	175
<i>People v. Kelley</i> (1977) 75 Cal.App.3d 672. ....	136
<i>People v. Kennedy</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 595. ....	147, 238, 240
<i>People v. Kimble</i> (1988) 44 Cal.3d 480. ....	205



<i>People v. King</i> (1978) 22 Cal.3d 12.....	83
<i>People v. Kipp</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 349.....	165
<i>People v. Kirkes</i> (1952) 39 Cal.2d 719.....	137
<i>People v. Kirkpatrick</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4th 988.....	220
<i>People v. Koontz</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 1041.....	144
<i>People v. Lavergne</i> (1971) 4 Cal.3d 735.....	173
<i>People v. Lawley</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 102.....	112, 231
<i>People v. Lee</i> (1987) 43 Cal.3d 666.....	62, 190
<i>People v. Lenart</i> (2004) 32 Cal.4th 1107.....	241, 242
<i>People v. Leon</i> (2008) 161 Cal.App.4th 149.....	117
<i>People v. Letner</i> (2010) 50 Cal.4th 99.....	59, 200
<i>People v. Lewis</i> (2001) 25 Cal.4th 610.....	83, 239
<i>People v. Lewis</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4th 334.....	186

<i>People v. Livingston</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1145. ....	109
<i>People v. Lucero</i> (1988) 44 Cal.3d 1006.....	146
<i>People v. Lucky</i> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 259.....	186, 187, 189
<i>People v. Manriquez</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4th 547. ....	45, 106, 197, 227, 249
<i>People v. Martinez</i> (2008) 158 Cal.App.4th 1324. ....	109, 115, 117, 199, 212
<i>People v. McElheny</i> (1982) 137 Cal.App.3d 396.....	129
<i>People v. McGreen</i> (1980) 107 Cal.App.3d 504.....	146
<i>People v. Medina</i> (1995) 11 Cal.4th 694. ....	244
<i>People v. Middleton</i> (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 19. ....	78
<i>People v. Mooc</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4th 1216. ....	151, 157, 158, 159, 160
<i>People v. Moore</i> (2011) 51 Cal.4th 386. ....	56, 60, 73
<i>People v. Morales</i> (2001) 25 Cal.4th 34. ....	235
<i>People v. Morales</i> (2003) 112 Cal.App.4th 1176.....	108, 115, 116