

**JONATHAN E. DEMSON**  
**ATTORNEY AT LAW**

**1158 26TH STREET #291**  
**SANTA MONICA, CA 90403**  
**(310) 405-0332**  
**JEDLAW@ME.COM**

May 8, 2022

Jorge E. Navarrete  
Clerk and Executive Officer  
Supreme Court of California  
Earl Warren Building  
350 McAllister Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**re: People v. Christopher Strong**  
**Supreme Court No. S266606**

Dear Mr. Navarrete:

I authored one of three amicus curiae briefs filed in the above-referenced matter, and I am writing to join in amicus curiae Office of the State Public Defender (OSPD)'s request for oral argument.

I am aware that, under rule 8.524(g) of the California Rules of Court, amicus curiae are not entitled to argument time but may ask a party for permission to use part of that party's time. But in this case, although all three amici filed briefs in support of appellant, appellant's counsel has filed a brief *opposing* amici's arguments and letters opposing amici's participation in oral argument. It therefore appears that amici will not be able to participate in oral argument unless granted permission to do so by the Court.

By my reading, the three amicus curiae briefs are substantially united in their arguments (specifically, the view that the resolution of this case turns on the proper application of the doctrine of issue preclusion). Because these arguments go to the crux of the issue on review, amici's participation at oral argument seems likely to be valuable to the Court in deciding this case.

Conversely, appellant's opposition to amici's arguments gives rise to the concern that amici's absence from oral argument may leave the Court without any party adequately prepared or motivated to present a rigorous defense of amici's arguments.

I recognize that, if the Court grants amicus curiae OSPD's request, it may also decide to limit amici's participation to a single lawyer, and I would be pleased to defer to the Court and to counsel for the other two amici on such matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan E. Demson  
Attorney at Law

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
Supreme Court of California

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
Supreme Court of California

Case Name: **PEOPLE v. STRONG**

Case Number: **S266606**

Lower Court Case Number: **C091162**

1. At the time of service I was at least 18 years of age and not a party to this legal action.
2. My email address used to e-serve: **jedlaw@me.com**
3. I served by email a copy of the following document(s) indicated below:

Title(s) of papers e-served:

<b>Filing Type</b>	<b>Document Title</b>
LETTER	S266606_LTR_AmicusCuriaeDemson

Service Recipients:

<b>Person Served</b>	<b>Email Address</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Date / Time</b>
Diane Boggess DOJ Sacramento/Fresno AWT Crim	Diane.Boggess@doj.ca.gov	e-Serve	5/8/2022 3:41:14 PM
Michelle Peterson Attorney at Law 111072	may111072@gmail.com	e-Serve	5/8/2022 3:41:14 PM
Eric Christoffersen Office of the Attorney General 186094	Eric.Christoffersen@doj.ca.gov	e-Serve	5/8/2022 3:41:14 PM
Attorney Attorney General - Sacramento Office Jennifer Poe, Deputy Attorney General	sacawtruefiling@doj.ca.gov	e-Serve	5/8/2022 3:41:14 PM
Deborah Hawkins Law Office of Deborah L. Hawkins 127133	dhawkins8350@gmail.com	e-Serve	5/8/2022 3:41:14 PM
Albert Kutchins Office of the State Public Defender 102322	aj.kutchins@ospd.ca.gov	e-Serve	5/8/2022 3:41:14 PM
Office Office Of The State Public Defender-Sac Timothy Foley, Sr. Deputy State Public Defender 000000	docketing@ospd.ca.gov	e-Serve	5/8/2022 3:41:14 PM

This proof of service was automatically created, submitted and signed on my behalf through my agreements with TrueFiling and its contents are true to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

5/8/2022

Date

/s/Jonathan Demson

---

Signature

Demson, Jonathan (167758)

---

Last Name, First Name (PNum)

Jonathan E. Demson, Attorney at Law

---

Law Firm