

SUPREME COURT COPY
In the Supreme Court of the State of California

COPY

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JUAN SANCHEZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

CAPITAL CASE

Case No. S087569

Tulare County Superior Court Case No.

VCF040863-98

Honorable Gerald Sevier, Judge

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF

KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General of California
MICHAEL P. FARRELL
Senior Assistant Attorney General
KENNETH N. SOKOLER
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
REBECCA WHITFIELD
Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 279441
1300 I Street, Suite 125
P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550
Telephone: (916) 324-5184
Fax: (916) 324-2160
Email: Rebecca.Whitfield@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff and Appellant

SUPREME COURT
FILED

JUL 28 2016

Frank A. McGuire Clerk
Deputy

DEATH PENALTY



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Statement of the Case.....	1
A. The Charging Document and Pretrial Motions.....	1
B. Sanchez’s First Two Trials.....	4
C. Sanchez’s Third Trial	5
Statement of Facts.....	8
A. Prosecution Evidence at the Guilt Phase	11
1. Discovery of the bodies	11
2. The murder scene.....	14
a. The bodies	14
b. DNA and fingerprint evidence	17
c. Gun evidence discovered in the house.....	17
3. Interviews leading to Sanchez’s arrest	18
4. Sanchez’s arrest and the evidence collected from his home	19
5. Interviews following Sanchez’s arrest.....	21
a. Oscar’s police interview	21
b. Sanchez’s police interviews	21
c. Sanchez’s confession.....	24
6. Neighborhood sightings of Sanchez prior to the murders	25
7. Evidence of Sanchez’s gun ownership	28
8. Sanchez’s conduct on the day before the murders	28
B. Defense Evidence at the Guilt Phase.....	30
1. Oscar’s credibility.....	30
a. Possible influences on Oscar	30
b. Oscar’s inconsistent statements.....	31

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
c. Oscar's therapy sessions and their influence on Oscar	31
2. Sanchez's testimony	33
a. Sanchez's actions prior to his arrest	33
b. Sanchez's explanations for his misrepresentations during police interviews	34
3. Sanchez's "false" confession.....	35
a. Sanchez's testimony	35
b. Expert testimony.....	36
4. Evidence corroborating Sanchez's actions the day before the murders.....	37
5. Evidence in conflict with the prosecution evidence	39
a. Hector Hernandez.....	39
b. Raul Madrid.....	39
c. Marcos Pena	40
C. Prosecution Evidence at the Penalty Phase	40
1. Sanchez's prior criminal record.....	40
2. Victim impact testimony	42
a. Rosa Chandi.....	42
b. Michelle Chandi	42
c. Victor Martinez	42
D. Defense Evidence at the Penalty Phase	43
1. Testimony regarding Sanchez's character.....	43
a. Tammy Lucio	43
b. Henry Lucio.....	43
c. Mary Lucio	44

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
d. John Jr.....	44
e. Pearl Mascorro.....	44
f. Carlos Canales	45
g. Jose Sanchez.....	45
h. Sandra Sanchez.....	46
i. Adriana Sanchez.....	46
j. Viviana Sanchez	47
k. Sonia Sanchez.....	47
l. Raul Sanchez	47
2. Expert testimony.....	48
Argument	49
I. The Trial Court Did Not Err by Allowing Oscar Hernandez to Testify Because He Understood His Duty to Tell the Truth	49
A. Background.....	49
1. In limine motion and section 402 hearing	49
a. Oscar’s testimony	50
b. Dr. Susan Streeter’s testimony	52
c. Andrea Culver’s testimony.....	53
d. Wanda Newton’s testimony	54
e. Police testimony	57
f. Trial court’s ruling.....	62
2. Oscar’s voir dire and testimony at the first trial	62
3. Oscar’s voir dire and testimony at the second trial.....	69
4. Testimony at the third trial concerning Oscar’s competency.....	74

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
a. Oscar's trial testimony.....	74
b. Oscar's inconsistent statements.....	76
c. Oscar's therapy sessions.....	77
d. Expert testimony.....	78
B. The Trial Court Did Not Err by Allowing Oscar to Testify, Because Oscar Demonstrated That He Understood His Duty to Tell the Truth.....	79
1. Applicable law.....	80
2. Oscar's multiple voir dire testimony demonstrated that he was aware of his duty to tell the truth.....	81
3. Testimony from other witnesses regarding Oscar's character for truthfulness also demonstrated that he understood his duty to tell the truth.....	85
4. Oscar's testimony at the third trial demonstrated that he understood his duty to be truthful.....	87
5. Oscar's prior statements and testimony did not provide a basis to exclude his testimony at the third trial.....	88
C. The Purported Error Was Harmless.....	93
1. Sanchez had a sufficient opportunity to cross-examine Oscar.....	95
2. Ample evidence apart from Oscar's statements and testimony, demonstrated Sanchez's guilt.....	98
II. The Trial Court Properly Found That Oscar Had a Present Recollection of the Events He Testified About Because He Demonstrated That He Had the Ability to Perceive and Recollect.....	103
A. Background.....	104

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
1. In limine motion challenging Oscar's capacity to testify	104
a. Oscar's testimony at the 402 hearing	105
b. Dr. Streeter's testimony concerning Oscar's personal knowledge.....	105
c. Wanda Newton's testimony concerning Oscar's personal knowledge.....	107
d. Testimony regarding alleged contamination of Oscar's perceptions at Rosa Chandi's house.....	110
e. The trial court's ruling.....	113
2. Proceedings at the first trial regarding Oscar's personal knowledge.....	114
3. Proceedings at the second trial regarding Oscar's personal knowledge.....	115
4. Proceedings at the third trial.....	117
a. Oscar's testimony	117
b. Testimony regarding events at Rosa Chandi's house following the discovery of the bodies.....	119
c. Oscar's therapy sessions.....	121
d. Expert testimony.....	122
B. The Trial Court Did Not Err by Allowing Oscar to Testify, Because Oscar Was in a Position to Perceive the Events That He Was Later Able to Testify About	123

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
1. The proper analysis under section 702 is to determine whether the witness was in a position to perceive the events and has the ability to recall them at the time of testimony	123
2. Oscar perceived the events he was able to recollect during his testimony	130
3. The evidence did not show that Oscar's recollections were shaped by others	132
a. Oscar's perceptions were not influenced by his interactions with people at Rosa's house	133
b. Oscar's perceptions were not influenced by his therapy sessions with Newton or his conversations with Nancy Fennell.....	137
C. The purported error was harmless	140
D. Sanchez's due process rights were not infringed....	141
III. Oscar's Identifications of Sanchez, Made Both Before and During Trial Were Not the Product of Unduly Suggestive Identification Procedures	141
A. Background.....	142
1. In limine motion and section 402 hearing ...	142
2. The trial court's ruling at Sanchez's third trial.....	146
B. The Court Properly Admitted Oscar's Identifications of Sanchez.....	148
1. The admission of Oscar's identification of Sanchez during the single-photo lineup did not violate due process	150
a. The identification process was not unduly suggestive	151

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
b. Oscar's identification resulting from the single photograph was reliable	154
c. Any suggestion on the part of Sergeant Kroutil did not cause Oscar to identify Sanchez.....	158
2. The admission of Oscar's identification of Sanchez following the six-person photo lineup did not violate due process	161
a. The six-person photo lineup was not unduly suggestive	162
b. Oscar's identification of Sanchez following the six-person photo lineup was reliable	170
3. The admission of Oscar's identification of Sanchez at trial did not deprive Sanchez of due process.....	172
C. The Purported Error Was Harmless.....	177
IV. The Trial Court Properly Allowed Police Officers to Testify About Statements Oscar Made the Morning of the Murders	178
A. Background.....	179
1. Oscar's interviews with the police on the morning of the murders	179
2. Oscar's interactions with people at Rosa's house	182
3. Sanchez's objection and the court's ruling.....	185
B. The Trial Court Properly Admitted Oscar's Prior Statements to Sergeants Dempsie and Kroutil Because They Constituted Spontaneous Statements.....	187

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
1. Applicable law	187
2. Oscar's statements to Sergeant Dempsie were spontaneous.....	189
3. Oscar's statement to Sergeant Kroutil was spontaneous	200
C. Oscar's Statement to Sergeant Kroutil Also Constituted a Prior Consistent Statement	203
1. Applicable law	203
2. Sanchez's charge that Oscar was influenced by bias, in the form of overheard conversations at Rosa's house and through his therapy sessions, provided the foundation to admit Oscar's statements that were consistent with his testimony	204
3. Although Oscar's inconsistent statements were not admitted into evidence, other inconsistent statements were admitted at trial, making Oscar's statements to Sergeant Kroutil ultimately admissible	208
D. Oscar's Statement to Sergeant Kroutil Also Constituted a Past Recollection Recorded.....	210
E. The Purported Error Was Harmless.....	215
V. The Court Properly Excluded Oscar's Prior Testimony and Interview With The Prosecution's Investigators Because They Were Not Relevant to His Credibility and Did Not Fall Under a Hearsay Exception	215
A. Background.....	216
1. Oscar's trial testimony.....	216
2. Oscar's statements to the prosecution's investigators.....	218
3. Oscar's testimony at the first trial	219

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
4. Oscar's testimony at the second trial.....	220
5. The court's ruling	221
B. Sanchez Forfeited His Claim That Oscar's Prior Statements Were Not Hearsay, and His Claim Fails Because the Statements Were Not Relevant	222
C. Oscar's Prior Statements Were Not Inconsistent With His Trial Testimony	228
D. Oscar's Prior Testimony Was Not Admissible Under Sections 1291 And 240, Because Oscar Was An Available Witness	234
E. Oscar's Prior Statements Were Not Admissible as a Past Recollection Recorded	238
F. Sanchez Was Not Denied His Right to Confront Oscar And Present A Defense Because He Was Given A Meaningful Opportunity To Cross-Examine Oscar	243
G. The Purported Error Was Harmless.....	243
VI. The Trial Court Properly Restricted the Testimony of Defense Expert Dr. Susan Streeter Because Opinion Testimony Regarding The Credibility of a Witness Is Not a Proper Subject for Expert Testimony, Making Any Hearsay Statements Supporting That Opinion Irrelevant	247
A. Background.....	247
1. In limine motion	247
2. Dr. Streeter's trial testimony	249
3. Evidence relating to possible influences on Oscar's perceptions.....	252

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
B. The Court Properly Limited Doctor Streeter’s Testimony to the General Development and Factors Bearing Upon The Reliability of a Child Oscar’s Age	255
1. Experts may only testify to subjects requiring special knowledge and not relating to common experience	256
2. Dr. Streeter’s opinion that Oscar was unreliable and not competent on the day of the murders was a question for the jury	257
a. Questions of credibility are not sufficiently beyond common experience that the expert’s opinion would assist the trier of fact	257
b. Because Dr. Streeter’s opinion regarding Oscar’s credibility was properly excluded, Oscar’s hearsay statements supporting that opinion were irrelevant.....	260
C. The Purported Error Was Harmless.....	267
VII. The Trial Court Properly Denied Sanchez’s Motion to Suppress His Confession Because He Never Invoked His Right to Silence, and The Confession Was Not Coerced	268
A. In limine motion and section 402 hearing	269
1. Sanchez’s interview with Sergeant Kroutil on the day of the murders.....	269
a. Prosecution evidence	269
b. Defense evidence.....	270
2. Sanchez’s Interview With Detective Shear on the Day After the Murders.....	272

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
a. Prosecution evidence.....	272
b. Defense evidence.....	277
3. Sanchez's confession to Lieutenant Garay two days after the murders.....	278
a. Prosecution evidence.....	278
b. Defense evidence.....	282
4. The court's ruling.....	284
B. Trial Evidence Regarding Sanchez's Confession...	286
1. Prosecution evidence.....	286
2. Sanchez's testimony.....	289
3. Expert testimony.....	290
C. Because Sanchez Did Not Unambiguously Invoke His Right to Remain Silent During His Interview With Detective Shear, There Was No <i>Miranda</i> Violation.....	293
1. Applicable law.....	293
2. Sanchez did not invoke his right to silence.....	296
3. Sanchez's confession was properly admitted even if he invoked his right to silence during his interview with Detective Shear.....	299
D. Sanchez's Confession To Lieutenant Garay Was Not the Product of Coercive Police Conduct.....	306
1. Applicable law.....	307
2. Sanchez's confession was voluntary.....	308
E. The Purported Error Was Harmless.....	315

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
VIII. The Court Properly Admitted Evidence of Sanchez’s Homosexual Relationship With Hector Hernandez Because It Was Relevant to Assess Hector’s Bias and Sanchez’s Credibility	318
A. Background	319
1. Pre-testimony discussion	319
2. Evidence of Hector’s bias	319
3. Evidence of Sanchez’s inconsistent statements to police	325
4. The court’s instructions	327
B. The Trial Court Did Not Abuse Its Discretion By Admitting Evidence of Sanchez’s Relationship With Hector, Because Its Probative Value Was Not Outweighed By Its Prejudicial Effect	328
1. Evidence of Sanchez’s relationship with Hector was relevant to show both Hector’s and Sanchez’s credibility	329
a. Sanchez’s relationship with Hector was relevant to assess Hector’s credibility when he testified that he did not see Sanchez on the morning of the murders	330
b. Sanchez’s relationship with Hector was relevant to Sanchez’s credibility during his testimony and his interviews with the police	333
2. Sanchez’s relationship with Hector was not unduly prejudicial	338
C. The Purported Error Was Harmless	342

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
IX. The Court Properly Admitted Statements Sanchez Made to Lieutenant Garay After He Invoked His Right to Silence to Impeach His Testimony at Trial	343
A. Background.....	344
B. The Relevance of Sanchez’s Affair With Hector Was Not Substantially Outweighed By Its Prejudicial Effect	346
C. The Court Properly Allowed The Prosecutor to Question Sanchez About His Statements to Lieutenant Garay	349
D. The Purported Error Was Harmless.....	353
X. The Trial Court Properly Admitted Evidence of Sanchez’s Gun Ownership Because It Was Relevant And Not Unduly Prejudicial	355
A. Background.....	355
1. Motion in limine	355
2. Evidence of Sanchez’s gun ownership presented at trial.....	356
B. The Court Properly Admitted Evidence of Sanchez’s Gun Ownership.....	357
1. Sanchez has forfeited his claim that Barrera’s testimony was inadmissible, because he did not object to it at trial	358
2. Sanchez’s ownership of a gun that could have been used to commit the murders was relevant	359
3. Evidence of Sanchez’s gun ownership was not unduly prejudicial.....	362
C. The Purported Error Was Harmless.....	363
XI. The Trial Properly Admitted Evidence of Sanchez’s Alleged Threat to Ermanda Under Section 403.....	364

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
A. Background.....	364
1. In limine motions regarding Sanchez’s threat to Ermanda.....	364
2. Testimony regarding Sanchez’s threat to Ermanda.....	366
3. Hearing regarding the prosecution’s basis for introducing evidence of Sanchez’s threats	371
B. The Trial Court Did Not Err By Conditionally Admitting Evidence of Sanchez’s Threat to Ermanda	374
C. The Instructions Cured Any Prejudice	379
D. The Purported Error Was Harmless.....	381
XII. The Prosecutor Did Not Commit Prejudicial Misconduct By Eliciting Hearsay Testimony Regarding Sanchez’s Threat To Ermanda Because the Prosecutor Had A Good Faith Belief That the Statements Were Admissible	382
A. Background.....	383
B. The Prosecutor Did Not Commit Misconduct By Eliciting Evidence of Sanchez’s Threat to Ermanda or By Refraining From Cautioning Witnesses About the Source Of Sanchez’s Statements.....	385
1. The prosecutor had a good faith belief based on investigation reports and conversations with the investigator that Sanchez’s statements were admissible	386
2. The Prosecutor did not commit error by failing to caution the witnesses to not reveal the source of Ortiz’s knowledge concerning Sanchez’s threat	390

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
a. Sanchez has forfeited his claim that the prosecutor committed misconduct for failing to admonish witnesses against revealing the source of Ortiz's knowledge.....	391
b. The prosecutor did not commit misconduct by failing to admonish witnesses against revealing the source of Ortiz's knowledge, because he did not believe he was eliciting inadmissible evidence and crafted his questions to guard against such risk.....	392
3. The prosecutor's conduct did not rise to the level of misconduct, because Sanchez cannot show he was denied a fair trial.....	395
C. The Purported Error Was Harmless.....	396
XIII. The Prosecutor Did Not Commit Prejudicial Misconduct By Appealing to The Emotions of the Jury Because the Prosecutor's Statements Did Not Invite The Jury to View the Case Through the Eyes of the Victim	397
A. Background.....	398
B. The Prosecutor's Comments Did Not Constitute Error.....	399
1. The prosecutor's statements were not improper.....	400
2. The statements did not rise to the level of misconduct.....	402
C. The Purported Error Was Harmless.....	404

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
XIV. Substantial Evidence Supports Sanchez’s Battery Against Tammy Lucio as an Aggravating Factor.....	405
A. Background.....	406
B. Substantial Evidence Supported the Admission Of Sanchez’s Battery Against Tammy	407
1. The trial court properly admitted evidence of Sanchez’s battery on Tammy ...	408
2. The court properly allowed the jury to determine whether Sanchez committed a battery.	409
C. The Purported Error Was Harmless.....	411
XV. There Was No Cumulative Prejudice From Guilt Phase And Penalty Phase Errors Warranting Reversal.....	415
XVI. California’s Death Penalty Statute Is Constitutional	418
A. California’s Death Penalty Statute Sufficiently Narrows The Class of Murders to Which it Applies and Is Thus Constitutional	419
B. Factor (a) Appropriately Allows The Jury To Consider Circumstances of the Crime	420
C. California’s Death Penalty Scheme and Corresponding Instructions Set Forth the Appropriate Burden of Proof.....	420
1. Aggravating factors outweigh mitigating factors	421
2. Burden of proof or no burden of proof.....	422
3. Unanimity of aggravating factors	422
4. The “so substantial” standard	423
5. Central determination whether death is the appropriate penalty	423
6. Presumption of life	424

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
D. The Jury Instructions Regarding Mitigating and Aggravating Factors Were Constitutional	424
E. The United States Constitution Does Not Require Inter-Case Proportionality Review of Death Sentences	425
F. California’s Death Penalty Law Does Not Deny Capital Defendants Equal Protection Under the Law	425
G. Application Of The Death Penalty Does Not Violate International Norms	426
Conclusion	428
Certificate of Compliance	429

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Apprendi v. New Jersey</i> (2000) 530 U.S. 466	421, 423
<i>Arizona v. Fulminante</i> (1991) 499 U.S. 279	315
<i>Berger v. United States</i> (1935) 295 U.S. 78	385
<i>Berghuis v. Thompkins</i> (2010) 560 U.S. 370	295
<i>Chapman v. California</i> (1967) 386 U.S. 18	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cunningham v. California</i> (2007) 549 U.S. 270	421, 422
<i>Davis v. United States</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 452	295, 296
<i>Foster v. California</i> (1969) 394 U.S. 440	151
<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> (1972) 408 U.S. 238	419
<i>Hanoch Tel-Oren v. Libyan Arab Republic</i> (D.D.C. 1981) 517 F.Supp. 542	427
<i>Harris v. New York</i> (1971) 401 U.S. 222	344, 350, 351
<i>In re Carlos M.</i> (1990) 220 Cal.App.3d 372	152
<i>In re Carlos M.</i> (1990) 220 Cal.App.3d 972	153

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>In re Cox</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 974	98
<i>In re Crystal J.</i> (1990) 218 Cal.App.3d 596	81
<i>In re Deon D.</i> (1989) 208 Cal.App.3d 953	230, 231
<i>In re Hill</i> (1969) 71 Cal.2d 997	151
<i>In re Joe R.</i> (1980) 27 Cal.3d 496	295
<i>Lujan v. Garcia</i> (9th Cir. 2013) 734 F.3d 917	299
<i>Matta-Ballesteros v. Henman</i> (7th Cir. 1990) 896 F.2d 255	427
<i>Michigan v. Mosley</i> (1975) 423 U.S. 96	<i>passim</i>
<i>Miranda v. Arizona</i> (1966) 384 U.S. 436	<i>passim</i>
<i>Neil v. Biggers</i> (1972) 409 U.S. 188	<i>passim</i>
<i>Oliva v. Hedgepeth</i> (C.D. Cal. 2009) 600 F.Supp.2d 1067	<i>passim</i>
<i>People v. Ainsworth</i> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 984	260
<i>People v. Alcala</i> (1992) 4 Cal.4th 742	235, 236, 237, 262

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>People v. Alvarez</i> (1996) 14 Cal.4th 155	385, 400
<i>People v. Anderson</i> (2001) 25 Cal.4th 543	<i>passim</i>
<i>People v. Anthony O.</i> (1992) 5 Cal.App.4th 428	189
<i>People v. Arias</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 92	395
<i>People v. Ausbie</i> (2004) 123 Cal.App.4th 855	410
<i>People v. Avila</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 491	92, 340
<i>People v. Avila</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 680	150
<i>People v. Ayala</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 225	399, 403, 404
<i>People v. Balcom</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4th 414	329, 341, 354
<i>People v. Barnwell</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4th 1038	359, 361
<i>People v. Bell</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4th 582	261
<i>People v. Boyer</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 412	410, 426
<i>People v. Brown</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 518	391, 405

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>People v. Bunyard</i> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 1189	416, 417
<i>People v. Burton</i> (1961) 55 Cal.2d 328	90
<i>People v Cahill</i> (1993) 5 Cal.4th 478	101, 315
<i>People v. Carey</i> (1986) 183 Cal.App.3d 99	295
<i>People v. Carpenter</i> (1997) 15 Cal.4th 312	163, 165, 261, 262
<i>People v. Carpenter</i> (1999) 21 Cal.4th 1016	359, 360, 363
<i>People v. Carter</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 1166	423
<i>People v. Carter</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 1114	359, 363
<i>People v. Clair</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 629	408
<i>People v. Clark</i> (1992) 3 Cal.4th 41	151
<i>People v. Clark</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4th 856	188, 189
<i>People v. Coffman and Marlow</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4th 1	258, 259, 260
<i>People v. Cole</i> (1956) 47 Cal.2d 99	258

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>People v. Coleman</i> (1985) 38 Cal.3d 69	261, 262
<i>People v. Contreras</i> (1993) 17 Cal.App.4th 813	149, 158
<i>People v. Cook</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4th 1334	148, 149
<i>People v. Cornwell</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4th 50	256, 257
<i>People v. Cowan</i> (2010) 50 Cal.4th 401	<i>passim</i>
<i>People v. Cox</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 916	359, 360
<i>People v. Craig</i> (1978) 86 Cal.App.3d 905	153
<i>People v. Crew</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 822	386, 392
<i>People v. Cudjo</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4th 585	88, 127
<i>People v. Cummings</i> (1993) 4 Cal.4th 1233	242
<i>People v. Cunningham</i> (2001) 25 Cal.4th 926	<i>passim</i>
<i>People v. D'Arcy</i> (2010) 48 Cal.4th 257	420
<i>People v. Davis</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 539	424

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>People v. Dean</i> (2009) 174 Cal.App.4th 186.....	262
<i>People v. Dement</i> (2011) 53 Cal. 4th 1.....	329
<i>People v. Dennis</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 468.....	<i>passim</i>
<i>People v. DeSantis</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 1198.....	<i>passim</i>
<i>People v. Doolin</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 390.....	124
<i>People v. Duff</i> (2014) 58 Cal.4th 527.....	307, 308
<i>People v. Dykes</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 731.....	294, 296, 386
<i>People v. Edwards</i> (1981) 126 Cal.App.3d 447.....	149
<i>People v. Edwards</i> (2013) 57 Cal. 4th 658.....	409, 410
<i>People v. Elliot</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4th 453.....	421, 422
<i>People v. Enraca</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 735.....	315
<i>People v. Eubanks</i> (2011) 53 Cal.4th 110.....	362
<i>People v. Fields</i> (1983) 35 Cal.3d 329.....	400

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>People v. Floyd</i> (1970) 1 Cal.3d 964.....	151
<i>People v. Gardeley</i> (1996) 14 Cal.4th 605.....	260, 261, 262
<i>People v. Ghent</i> (1987) 43 Cal.3d 739.....	427
<i>People v. Gonzales</i> (2011) 51 Cal.4th 894.....	261
<i>People v. Gonzales</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 1234.....	<i>passim</i>
<i>People v. Griffin</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 536.....	409
<i>People v. Guillebeau</i> (1980) 107 Cal.App.3d 531.....	163
<i>People v. Guitierrez</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 789.....	197
<i>People v. Hamilton</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 863.....	223, 416
<i>People v. Harris</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1269.....	328
<i>People v. Hart</i> (1999) 20 Cal.4th 546.....	408
<i>People v. Hawthorne</i> (1992) 4 Cal.4th 43.....	229
<i>People v. Hayes</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 577.....	206, 207

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>People v. Henderson</i> (1976) 58 Cal.App.3d 349	359
<i>People v. Hernandez</i> (1988) 204 Cal.App.3d 639	149
<i>People v. Hill</i> (1992) 3 Cal.4th 959	223
<i>People v. Hill</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 800	385, 399
<i>People v. Hillhouse</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 469	426, 427
<i>People v. Homick</i> (2012) 55 Cal.4th 816	229, 230, 231, 351
<i>People v. Howard</i> (2010) 51 Cal.4th 15	422, 424
<i>People v. Hoyos</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4th 872	426
<i>People v. Hughey</i> (1987) 194 Cal.App.3d 1383	188
<i>People v. Jackson</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 662	400
<i>People v. Jefferson</i> (2015) 238 Cal. App. 4th 494	328
<i>People v. Jenkins</i> (2000) 22 Cal.4th 900	427
<i>People v. Jennings</i> <i>supra</i> , 46 Cal.3d at p. 979	294, 295, 298

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>People v. Johnson</i> (1992) 3 Cal.4th 1183.....	162, 163
<i>People v. Jones</i> (1968) 268 Cal.App.2d 161	359
<i>People v. Jones</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 1084.....	415
<i>People v. Jones</i> (2011) 51 Cal. 4th 346.....	408
<i>People v. Jones</i> (2013) 57 Cal.4th 899.....	359
<i>People v. Kennedy</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 595.....	148, 156, 157, 204
<i>People v. Kronemyer</i> (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 314	416
<i>People v. Leonard</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4th 1370.....	392
<i>People v. Lessie</i> (2010) 47 Cal.4th 1152.....	294
<i>People v. Lewis</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4th 334.....	<i>passim</i>
<i>People v. Lewis</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4th 415.....	413, 426
<i>People v. Linton</i> (2013) 56 Cal.4th 1146.....	419
<i>People v. Lomax</i> (2010) 49 Cal.4th 530.....	422, 423, 424

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>People v. Loy</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4th 46.....	418
<i>People v. Lucas</i> (1995) 12 Cal.4th 415.....	387
<i>People v. Lynch</i> (2010) 50 Cal.4th 693.....	198, 199, 425
<i>People v. Lyons</i> (1992) 10 Cal.App.4th 837.....	90, 91, 92
<i>People v. Marks</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 197.....	223
<i>People v. Martinez</i> (1989) 207 Cal.App.3d 1204.....	152, 153
<i>People v. McDonald</i> (1984) 37 Cal.3d 351.....	258
<i>People v. McDowell</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 395.....	423, 424
<i>People v. McKinnon</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4th 610.....	413
<i>People v. McWhorter</i> (2009) 47 Cal.4th 318.....	307, 309
<i>People v. McWhorter</i> <i>supra</i> , 47 Cal.4th at p. 47.....	307, 308, 386
<i>People v. Mendoza</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 896.....	258
<i>People v. Mendoza</i> (2007) 42 Cal.4th 686.....	423

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>People v. Mendoza</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4th 1056.....	328
<i>People v. Merriman</i> (2014) 60 Cal.4th 1.....	94
<i>People v. Mills</i> (2010) 48 Cal.4th 158.....	328, 342
<i>People v. Mincey</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 408.....	<i>passim</i>
<i>People v. Moore</i> (2011) 51 Cal.4th 386.....	418
<i>People v. Myles</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1181.....	405
<i>People v. Nelson</i> (2011) 51 Cal.4th 198.....	411, 419, 420
<i>People v. Nelson</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 367.....	294
<i>People v. Nguyen</i> (1994) 23 Cal.App.4th 32.....	152
<i>People v. Nguyen</i> (1995) 40 Cal.App.4th 28.....	391
<i>People v. Nicolaus</i> (1991) 54 Cal.3d 551.....	262
<i>People v. Noguera</i> (1992) 4 Cal.4th 599.....	206, 234, 235, 237
<i>People v. Ochoa</i> (1998) 19 Cal.4th 353.....	151, 158, 408, 409