

In the Supreme Court of the State of California

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JUAN VILLA RAMIREZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

CAPITAL CASE

Case No. S099844

SUPREME COURT FILED

MAR 28 2014

Frank A. McGuire Clerk

Kern County Superior Court Case No. SC076259A
Honorable Kenneth C. Twisselman, Judge

Deputy

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF

KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General of California
DANE R. GILLETTE
Chief Assistant Attorney General
MICHAEL P. FARRELL
Senior Assistant Attorney General
SEAN M. MCCOY
Deputy Attorney General
LEANNE LE MON
Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 215005
2550 Mariposa Mall, Room 5090
Fresno, CA 93721
Telephone: (559) 477-1674
Fax: (559) 445-5106
Email: Leanne.LeMon@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff and Respondent

DEATH PENALTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Statement of the Case.....	1
Statement of Facts	3
I. People’s case-in-chief	3
A. October 4, 1997 kidnapping of Leonel Paredes.....	3
B. October 14, 1997 assault on Juan Carlos Ramirez	6
C. October 14, 1997 murder of Chad Yarbrough.....	7
1. Autopsy	13
2. Appellant’s Arrest and Statement.....	13
3. Gang Evidence.....	15
II. Defense case.....	15
A. October 4, 1997 kidnapping of Leonel Paredes.....	15
B. Chad Yarbrough murder	16
1. September 1997 Incident	16
C. Appellant’s testimony	19
D. Expert testimony.....	22
1. Eyewitness Identification Expert.....	22
2. Psychiatric Expert.....	23
3. Forensic Pathologist.....	23
4. Criminalist	24
5. Clinical Psychologist	24
6. Substance Abuse Expert	25
7. Criminal Street Gang Expert	25
III. People’s rebuttal.....	26
IV. Penalty phase	27
A. Prosecution’s case.....	27
1. August 22, 1997 – Methamphetamine Case.....	27
2. March 15, 1995 – Ibarra Murder	27
3. Victim Impact Evidence	29
B. Defense case.....	30

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
1. Ibarra Murder.....	30
2. Family Testimony.....	31
3. Expert Testimony.....	33
C. Stipulations	34
V. Bifurcated trial on counts 10 and 11	34
A. August 22, 1997.....	34
B. Stipulations.....	35
Argument.....	35
I. The trial court properly denied appellant’s change of venue motions	35
A. Record.....	35
1. Change of Venue Hearings.....	35
a. May-June 2000 Motion	35
b. December 2000- January 2001 Change of Venue Motion	36
2. Jury Voir Dire.....	37
3. Change of Venue Motions During Trial.....	42
a. February 5, 2001.....	42
b. February 9, 2001.....	43
B. Law and analysis.....	45
1. Nature and Gravity Of The Offense	46
2. Nature And Extent Of News Coverage	47
3. Size Of The Community.....	51
4. Status Of Appellant.....	53
5. Prominence Of Victim.....	54
6. Appellant Has Failed to Show A Reasonable Likelihood That He Did Not Receive A Fair Trial	55
II. The trial court acted within its broad discretion in denying appellant’s challenges for cause; assuming there was error it was harmless.....	58
A. Appellant’s claim is forfeited.....	58

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
B. The trial court acted within its discretion in denying appellant's challenges for cause	58
1. Dennis Herbert (Prospective Juror No. 200079847)	61
2. Patricia O'Neill (Prospective Juror No. 200336322)	62
3. George Haller (Prospective Juror 200074069)	64
4. Juror No. 12 (200322141).....	64
5. Silver Ordiway (Prospective Juror 200286463)	65
6. Roger Dilbeck (Prospective Juror No. 200080030)	67
7. Floyd Moore (Prospective Juror No. 20006880)	68
8. Juror No. 11 (200239389).....	69
9. Michelle Diaz (Prospective Juror No. 200233871)	70
10. Raymond Benson (Prospective Juror No. 200266117)	72
11. Juror No. 8 (200061224).....	74
12. Juror No. 10 (200343496).....	75
13. Charles Julian (Prospective Juror No. 200206127)	76
14. Juror No. 7 (200199345).....	77
15. Jane McKee (Prospective Juror No. 200222276)	79
16. Donna Wilson (Prospective Juror No. 200190765)	80
17. Felix Rodriguez (Prospective Juror No. 200161953)	81
18. Betty Hallum (Prospective Juror No. 200158112)	82
19. Wayne Epperson (Prospective Juror No. 200207952)	83

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
20. Jess Reeder (Prospective Juror No. 200191213)	83
21. Alternate No. 2 (Juror No. 200116134).....	84
22. Sherry Williams (Prospective Juror No. 200106487)	85
23. Betty Emms (Prospective Juror No. 200213509)	87
24. Ernest Shaw (Prospective Juror No. 200167435)	87
25. Glen Kellerhals (Prospective Juror No. 200133204)	88
26. Juror No. 3 (200316337).....	92
27. Richard Holmes (Prospective Juror No. 2300318135)	93
28. Alternate Juror No. 5	93
29. Kimberley Lindgren (Prospective Juror No. 200351872)	95
30. Juror No. 1 (No. 200151234).....	95
31. Robert Murphy (Prospective Juror No. 200250180)	96
32. Alternate Juror No. 1 (200263191).....	98
33. Gary Moreno (Prospective Juror No. 200325950)	99
34. Dianne Krotter (Prospective Juror No. 200266599)	100
35. Lee Woolfolk (Prospective Juror No. 200247847)	100
36. Teresa Gonzales (Prospective Juror No. 200245105)	101
37. Jeffrey Hart (Prospective Juror No. 200290059)	102
38. Juror No. 2 (200336734).....	103
39. Jerry Franklin (Prospective Juror No. 200352346)	103
40. Edward Caudill (Prospective Juror No. 200252753)	104

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
41. Michael Cera (Prospective Juror No. 200318903)	105
42. Juror No. 4 (200118551).....	106
43. Juror No. 6 (200301163).....	107
44. David Bohanon (Prospective Juror No. 200297577)	107
45. Charles West (Prospective Juror No. 200221567)	109
46. Lorraine Kilby (Prospective Juror No. 2000013345)	110
47. Josie Pinkston (Prospective Juror No. 200366521)	110
48. Steven Turner (Prospective Juror No. 200282539)	111
49. The Manner In Which the Trial Court Conducted Voir Dire Was Proper.....	112
C. Assuming arguendo that the trial court abused its discretion, any error was harmless because appellant fails to establish that any of the seated jurors were biased	
	113
III. The trial court’s dismissal of prospective juror Katy Gonzalez did not violate appellant’s constitutional rights and reversal of the death penalty judgment is not required	
	114
A. The record	114
B. Law and analysis.....	118
IV. The trial court properly denied appellant’s motion for a mistrial based on its exercise of discretion in conducting voir dire on the scope of death qualification and juror bias	
	122
A. Relevant law	122
B. The trial court properly denied appellant’s motion for mistrial based on the court’s handling of voir dire	124

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
C. The trial court properly denied appellant's mistrial motion	135
V. Appellant fails to establish that juror no. 11 committed prejudicial misconduct	136
VI. The trial court properly denied appellant's motion to dismiss juror nos. 1 and 11 from the jury	140
A. Law	140
B. The trial court properly determined there was not good cause to discharge juror no. 1	142
C. The trial court properly found there was not good cause to discharge juror no. 11	144
VII. The trial court properly denied appellant's motion to dismiss all correctional officers from appellant's jury pool.....	145
VIII. The trial court properly denied appellant's Batson/Wheeler challenges	149
A. Relevant proceedings	149
B. Applicable legal principles	152
C. Discussion	154
1. Mr. Bell	155
2. Teresa Delacruz, Felix Rodriguez, and Joyce Barreto	157
IX. The trial court properly admitted the gang evidence; any error was harmless.....	162
A. Trial court proceedings	162
B. The trial court did not abuse its discretion in admitting the gang evidence	165
C. Any error in the admission of the gang evidence was harmless	168

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
X. The trial court properly admitted appellant's statement to police because he voluntarily, knowingly and intelligently waived his miranda rights.....	171
A. Procedural background	171
B. Appellant did not invoke his right to remain silent, and made a voluntary, knowing, and intelligent waiver of his Miranda rights.....	174
1. Appellant Did Not Invoke His Right to Remain Silent on July 19, 1998	175
2. Appellant Waived His Miranda Rights	177
C. Appellant's confession was voluntary	179
D. Appellant cannot demonstrate prejudice	181
XI. The trial court properly admitted the recorded statement of Carlos Rosales	183
A. Background	184
B. The January 2, 1998, recording was properly admitted by the trial court.....	186
XII. Appellant's conviction for his crimes against Parades and Juan Carlos Ramirez are supported by substantial evidence	193
A. Standard of review	193
B. Substantial evidence supports a finding that appellant was guilty of the crimes against Leonel Paredes (counts 7, 8, 9).....	194
C. Substantial evidence supports a finding that appellant was guilty of the crimes against Juan Carlos Ramirez (counts 4 and 6).....	195
1. Sufficient Evidence Supports Appellant's Conviction for Kidnapping During the Commission of a Carjacking	195
2. There was Sufficient Evidence to Support the Conviction of Count 6.....	198

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
XIII. The trial court properly exercised its discretion to direct that motions based on prosecutorial misconduct be asked at sidebar	199
A. Relevant facts	199
B. The trial court properly exercised its discretion by ruling that motions based on prosecutorial misconduct be addressed outside the presence of the jury	202
XIV. Appellant fails to establish that the prosecutor committed prejudicial misconduct	204
A. Relevant law	205
B. Analysis	206
1. The Questioning of Daniel Quintana Did Not Amount to Prosecutorial Misconduct ...	206
2. The Prosecutor Did Not Commit Prosecutorial Misconduct By His Reference To Chinese-Manufactured Ammunition Or In His Questioning Of Appellant Regarding His Purchase of Guns	208
3. The Prosecutor’s Cross-Examination of Defense Investigator Mosley Did Not Amount to Prosecutorial Misconduct; and Appellant Suffered No Prejudice	212
4. The Prosecutor’s Cross-Examination of Appellant Regarding Lamont and Arvina Gang Members Was Proper	213
5. The Prosecutor’s Cross-Examination Of Appellant Regarding His Arrest, Drug Use and Posting of Bail Was Proper	215
a. August 22, 1997	215
b. Whether Appellant Lost His Job Due to Drug Use	216
c. Bail	217

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
6. The Prosecutor’s Request That Beatriz Garza Be Subject to Recall Was Not Prosecutorial Misconduct	218
XV. The trial court properly denied appellant’s motion to recuse the Kern County District Attorney’s Office	220
A. Factual background.....	220
B. The trial court’s ruling denying the recusal motion was correct.....	222
XVI. Appellant’s due process rights were not violated by the prosecutor’s penalty phase argument regarding the Javier Ibarra murder	226
A. Factual background.....	226
B. Appellant’s due process rights were not violated by the prosecutor’s argument that appellant was the shooter in the Ibarra murder.....	231
C. Appellant’s due process right and right to present a defense were not violated by the trial court’s ruling that appellant could not introduce evidence concerning the people’s two prior closing arguments	236
D. The prosecutor did not commit prejudicial misconduct by presenting evidence that appellant was the shooter in the Javier Ibarra murder	237
E. The prosecutor’s argument was not prejudicial error.....	239
XVII. The evidence was sufficient to allow any juror to find beyond a reasonable doubt that appellant murdered Javier Ibarra.....	241
XVIII. The trial court properly admitted Cipriano Ramirez’s statements; any error was harmless.....	244
A. Background.....	244

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
B. There was no violation of the confrontation clause.....	246
C. Evidence code section 1230.....	248
D. Evidence code section 1223.....	249
E. Statement to Deputy Cervantes.....	250
F. Harmless error.....	250
XIX. Appellant’s violation of health and safety code section 11370.1 constituted proper factor (b) evidence	251
A. Background	252
B. There was sufficient evidence for the jury to consider the weapons and drug evidence because it involved an implied threat of force or violence	252
XX. Appellant fails to establish that prosecutorial misconduct occurred; any error in allowing the prosecutor to impeach appellant with conduct that involved moral turpitude was harmless	255
A. Background	255
B. Appellant fails to establish that the prosecutor committed misconduct by cross-examining appellant concerning his prior misdemeanor acts involving moral turpitude	260
C. The trial court properly allowed appellant to be impeached with his prior misdemeanor conduct involving moral turpitude	261
XXI. The trial court properly ruled that the prosecutor could rebut appellant’s mitigation evidence regarding his prior incarceration; appellant fails to show prejudice since the challenged evidence was not presented to the jury	264
A. Background	265
1. Lerdo Jail Incident	265

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
2. Evidence That Appellant Had Been Shot and Jumped	267
B. The prosecution’s proffered rebuttal evidence was proper to balance appellant’s evidence of his good character	268
C. Assuming the trial court erred in its tentative ruling, any error was harmless in light of the evidence presented at the penalty phase	271
XXII. The trial court properly exercised its discretion by excluding mitigating evidence of specific events that occurred prior to appellant’s birth.....	274
A. Background.....	274
B. The trial court properly exercised its discretion in ruling that evidence of abuse prior to appellant’s birth was irrelevant.....	279
C. Assuming arguendo the trial court erred, there was no prejudice in light of the mitigating evidence presented.....	281
XXIII. The trial court properly exercised its discretion to exclude evidence of the effect appellant’s execution would have on his family	282
A. Background.....	282
B. The trial court correctly ruled that the jury could not consider the effect appellant’s execution would have on his family.....	283
XXIV. Appellant’s due process right to an impartial trial judge was not violated by the trial court’s conduct	286
A. The trial court was not biased during voir dire.....	288
B. The trial court did not harass defense counsel by threatening to pursue formal sanctions from the state bar	290
C. The trial court did not demonstrate favoritism toward the prosecution.....	292

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
D. Judge Quashnick's ruling.....	292
E. The trial court did not commit misconduct by allowing the prosecutor to argue that appellant was the shooter in the Ibarra murder	293
F. The trial court properly implemented procedural rules regarding motions based on prosecutorial misconduct	294
G. Appellant's claim that the court reported attorney John Anthony Bryan to the state bar is a matter that is outside the appellate record and should not be considered on direct appeal	294
XXV. Appellant's conviction and death sentence do not violate international law.....	295
XXVI. There is a sufficient record on appeal for this court to address and reject appellant's Vienna convention claim ...	296
A. Background	297
1. December 2000 Suppression Motion	297
2. July 2001 - New Trial Motion/Motion to Reduce Penalty	298
B. There is a sufficient record for this court to deny appellant's claim	298
1. The Vienna Convention on Consular Relations and Avena	298
a. The Vienna Convention: Its purpose and preamble	298
b. Article 36	299
c. The International Court of Justice Decision In Avena	300
d. United States Supreme Court Precedent following Avena	300
2. The Trial Court Properly Denied Appellant's Motion to Suppress and Motion for New Trial.....	302

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
XXVII. California's death penalty scheme is constitutional	304
A. California's death penalty scheme is not impermissibly broad	305
B. Burden of proof for aggravating factors	305
C. Section 190.3, factor (a).....	306
D. Section 190.3, factor (b)	306
E. The jury was not required to make written findings	307
F. The united states constitution does not require inter-case proportionality review of death sentences	307
G. Disparate sentence review	308
H. Cruel and unusual punishment.....	308
XXVIII. Appellant's convictions on counts 10 and 11 should be affirmed	309
XXIX. The trial court was not required to give an instruction on lingering doubt	310
XXX. The trial court properly denied appellant's motion to preclude the people from seeking the death penalty.....	311
XXXI. Appellant was not prejudiced by the cumulative effect of any alleged errors during the guilt phase.....	312
XXXII. Appellant was not prejudiced by the cumulative impact of any alleged errors during this case	312
Conclusion.....	313

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Andrews v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd.</i> (1981) 28 Cal.3d 781	288
<i>Arizona v. Fulminante</i> (1991) 499 U.S. 279	181
<i>Batson v. Kentucky</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 79	149, 152
<i>Berger v. United States</i> (1935) 295 U.S. 78	310
<i>Berghuis v. Thompkins</i> (2010) 560 U.S. 370	passim
<i>Blackburn v. Alabama</i> (1960) 361 U.S. 199	180
<i>Booth v. Maryland</i> (1987) 482 U.S. 496	284
<i>Bracy v. Gramley</i> (1997) 520 U.S. 899	287
<i>Bradshaw v. Stumpf</i> (2005) 545 U.S. 175	234
<i>Breard v. Greene</i> (1998) 523 U.S. 371	303
<i>Bruton v. United States</i> (1968) 391 U.S. 123	246, 248
<i>Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.</i> (2009) 556 U.S. 868	287
<i>Chambers v. Mississippi</i> (1973) 410 U.S. 284	168

<i>Chapman v. California</i> , (1967) 386 U.S. 18.....	passim
<i>Covarrubias v. Superior Court</i> (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 1168.....	61
<i>Crawford v. Washington</i> (2004) 541 U.S. 36.....	246, 247
<i>Davis v. United States</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 452.....	175
<i>Davis v. Washington</i> (2006) 547 U.S. 813.....	246, 248
<i>Estelle v. McGuire</i> (1991) 502 U.S. 62.....	168
<i>Fain v. Superior Court</i> (1970) 2 Cal.3d 46.....	51
<i>Franklin v. Lynaugh</i> (1988) 487 U.S. 164.....	310
<i>Frazier v. Superior Court</i> (1971) 5 Cal.3d 287.....	51
<i>Garcia v. Texas</i> (2011) __ U.S. __ [131 S.Ct. 2866].....	301, 302, 303
<i>Hambarian v. Superior Court</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 826.....	222
<i>Haraguchi v. Superior Court</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4th 706.....	222
<i>Hernandez v. Martel</i> (C.D. Cal. 2011) 824 F. Supp.2d 1025.....	280
<i>Hovey v. Superior Court</i> (1980) 28 Cal.3d 1.....	37, 134
<i>In re Carpenter</i> (1995) 9 Cal.4th 634.....	137, 138, 141, 294

<i>In re Crew</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4th 126	279
<i>In re Gay</i> (1998) 19 Cal.4th 771	280
<i>In re Joe R.</i> (1980) 27 Cal.3d 496	176
<i>In re Lynette G.</i> (1976) 54 Cal.App.3d 1087.....	197
<i>In re Murchison</i> (1955) 349 U.S. 133	287
<i>In re Ogea</i> (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 974.....	253
<i>In re S.C.</i> (2006) 138 Cal.App.4th 396.....	79, 81
<i>In re Sakarias</i> (2005) 35 Cal.4th 140	passim
<i>Irvin v. Dowd</i> (1961) 366 U.S. 717	56, 57
<i>Johnson v. California</i> (2005) 545 U.S. 162	153
<i>Kreling v. Superior Court</i> (1944) 25 Cal.2d 305	287
<i>Liteky v. United States</i> (1994) 510 U.S. 540	288, 293
<i>Lockett v. Ohio</i> (1978) 438 U.S. 586	279
<i>Lockhart v. McCree</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 162	123
<i>Maine v. Superior Court</i> (1968) 68 Cal.2d 375	51

<i>Martinez v. Superior Court</i> (1981) 29 Cal.3d 574	51
<i>McCleskey v. Kemp</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 279	296
<i>Medellin v. Texas</i> (2008) 552 U.S. 491	301, 303
<i>Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts</i> (2009) 557 U.S. 305	187
<i>Michigan v. Mosley</i> (1975) 423 U.S. 96	177
<i>Miranda v. Arizona</i> (1966) 384 U.S. 436	passim
<i>Montana v. Egelhoff</i> (1996) 518 U.S. 37	168
<i>Morgan v. Illinois</i> (1992) 504 U.S. 719	61, 123, 130
<i>Mu'Min v. Virginia</i> (1991) 500 U.S. 415	61, 124
<i>Murphy v. Florida</i> (1975) 421 U.S. 794	56
<i>North Carolina v. Butler</i> (1979) 441 U.S. 369	177
<i>Odle v. Superior Court</i> (1982) 32 Cal.3d 932	47, 49, 57
<i>Ohio v. Roberts</i> (1980) 448 U.S. 56	247
<i>Payne v. Tennessee</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 808	284, 285
<i>People v. Abilez</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4th 472	119

<i>People v. Alvarez</i> (1996) 14 Cal.4th 155	262
<i>People v. Aranda</i> (1965) 63 Cal.2d 518	246, 248
<i>People v. Ashmus</i> (1991) 54 Cal.3d 932	272, 275
<i>People v. Avila</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 491	152, 162, 207
<i>People v. Ayala</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 225	122, 205, 220
<i>People v. Bacon</i> (2010) 50 Cal.4th 1082	252
<i>People v. Balderas</i> (1985) 41 Cal.3d 144	51
<i>People v. Beeman</i> (1984) 35 Cal.3d 547	196
<i>People v. Beivelman</i> (1968) 70 Cal.2d 60.....	238, 239
<i>People v. Bell</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4th 582	153, 154, 155
<i>People v. Bemore</i> (2000) 22 Cal.4th 809	283
<i>People v. Bennett</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 577	283, 312
<i>People v. Blacksher</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4th 769	153
<i>People v. Blair</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 686	295
<i>People v. Bolin</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 297	188

<i>People v. Bonilla</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4th 313	63, 153, 156
<i>People v. Bonin</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 659	passim
<i>People v. Bowman</i> (1966) 240 Cal.App.2d 358.....	203
<i>People v. Box</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 1153	311
<i>People v. Boyde</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 212	263
<i>People v. Boyer</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 412	194
<i>People v. Brasure</i> (2008) 42 Cal.4th 1037	308
<i>People v. Brown</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4th 322	287, 293
<i>People v. Brown</i> (1994) 8 Cal.4th 746	189, 287
<i>People v. Brown</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 382	296
<i>People v. Burgener</i> (2003) 29 Cal.4th 833	189
<i>People v. Cage</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4th 965	247
<i>People v. Carasi</i> (2008) 44 Cal.4th 1263	133
<i>People v. Carpenter</i> (1997) 15 Cal.4th 312	269, 287, 292
<i>People v. Carter</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 1214	91

<i>People v. Castro</i> (1985) 38 Cal.3d 301	262, 263
<i>People v. Champion</i> (1995) 9 Cal.4th 879	163, 166, 167
<i>People v. Clark</i> (2011) 52 Cal. 4th 856	205, 260
<i>People v. Cleveland</i> (2004) 32 Cal.4th 704	61, 123
<i>People v. Cole</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 1158	passim
<i>People v. Coleman</i> (1989) 48 Cal.3d 112	52
<i>People v. Conner</i> (1983) 34 Cal.3d 141	222
<i>People v. Cook</i> (2006) 39 Cal.4th 566.....	296
<i>People v. Cornwell</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4th 50	149, 154, 155
<i>People v. Cox</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 916	135
<i>People v. Crew</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 822	213
<i>People v. Crittenden,</i> (1994) 9 Cal.4th 83.....	68
<i>People v. Cunningham</i> (2001) 25 Cal.4th 926	313
<i>People v. Daniels</i> (1991) 52 Cal.3d 815	55, 140, 269
<i>People v. Danks</i> (2004) 32 Cal.4th 269	passim

<i>People v. Davis</i> (1995) 10 Cal.4th 463	262
<i>People v. Davis</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 539	174, 183, 247
<i>People v. Dennis</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 468	45, 46, 47, 54
<i>People v. Doolin</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 390	154
<i>People v. Duenas</i> (2012) 55 Cal.4th 1	91
<i>People v. Duncan</i> (1991) 53 Cal.3d 955	310
<i>People v. Dykes</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 731	253, 254
<i>People v. Elliot</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4th 453	305, 306, 307
<i>People v. Elwood</i> (1988) 199 Cal.App.3d 1365.....	194
<i>People v. Enraca</i> (2012) 53 Cal. 4th 735	303
<i>People v. Eubanks</i> (1996) 14 Cal.4th 580	222
<i>People v. Fairbank</i> (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1223	308
<i>People v. Farnam</i> (2002) 28 Cal.4th 107	97, 100, 154, 156
<i>People v. Fauber</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 792	281
<i>People v. Fierro</i> (1991) 1 Cal.4th 173	269

<i>People v. Foster</i> (2010) 50 Cal.4th 1301	241, 242, 243, 307
<i>People v. Freeman</i> (2010) 47 Cal.4th 993	287
<i>People v. Fudge</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4th 1075	61
<i>People v. Fuiava</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 622	167
<i>People v. Funes</i> (1994) 23 Cal.App.4th 1506.....	166
<i>People v. Gamache</i> (2010) 48 Cal.4th 347	224, 225
<i>People v. Gann</i> (2011) 193 Cal.App.4th 994.....	250
<i>People v. Garceau</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4th 140	165, 186, 253, 255
<i>People v. Geier</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4th 555	187, 248, 249
<i>People v. Ghent</i> (1987) 43 Cal.3d 739	59, 296
<i>People v. Gonzales</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 1234	283, 305, 306
<i>People v. Gonzalez</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 932	270, 271
<i>People v. Green</i> (1971) 3 Cal.3d 981.....	191
<i>People v. Green</i> (1980) 27 Cal.3d 1	202
<i>People v. Griffin</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 536	152

<i>People v. Guerra</i> (2006) 37 Cal.4th 1067	308
<i>People v. Gurule</i> (2002) 28 Cal.4th 557	189
<i>People v. Harris</i> (1981) 28 Cal.3d 935	54
<i>People v. Harris</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4th 310	passim
<i>People v. Harris</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1269	142, 143, 144
<i>People v. Harris</i> (2013) 57 Cal.4th 804	passim
<i>People v. Hayes</i> (1999) 21 Cal.4th 1211	36, 52
<i>People v. Hernandez</i> (1988) 47 Cal.3d 315	47, 167, 280
<i>People v. Hernandez</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 1040	166
<i>People v. Hill</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 800	197, 205, 206, 260
<i>People v. Hillhouse</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 469	62, 113, 296
<i>People v. Hinton</i> (2006) 37 Cal.4th 839	passim
<i>People v. Holt</i> (1997) 15 Cal.4th 619	124
<i>People v. Horning</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4th 871	59
<i>People v. Hovarter</i> (2008) 44 Cal.4th 983	295

<i>People v. Howard</i> (2010) 51 Cal.4th 15	305, 307, 308
<i>People v. Hoyos</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4th 872	119
<i>People v. Huggins</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 175	241
<i>People v. Hughes</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 287	281
<i>People v. Humiston</i> (1993) 20 Cal.App.4th 460.....	212
<i>People v. Jablonski</i> (2006) 37 Cal.4th 774	305
<i>People v. Jenkins</i> (2000) 22 Cal.4th 900	79, 94, 296
<i>People v. Jennings</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 963	176
<i>People v. Jennings</i> (1991) 53 Cal.3d 334	47
<i>People v. Johnson</i> (1980) 26 Cal.3d 557	193
<i>People v. Koontz</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 1041	244
<i>People v. Kraft</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 978	168
<i>People v. Lancaster</i> (2007) 41 Cal.4th 50	153
<i>People v. Lang</i> (1989) 49 Cal.3d 991	261, 262, 263
<i>People v. Laursen</i> (1972) 8 Cal.3d 192.....	196

<i>People v. Lawley</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 102	310
<i>People v. Ledesma</i> (2006) 39 Cal.4th 641	passim
<i>People v. Leonard</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4th 1370	50
<i>People v. Lewis</i> (2008) 43 Cal.4th 415	295, 296
<i>People v. Lewis</i> (2009) 46 Cal.4th 1255	137, 141
<i>People v. Lomax</i> (2010) 49 Cal.4th 530	306
<i>People v. Lynch</i> (2010) 50 Cal.4th 693	121
<i>People v. Maciel</i> (2013) 57 Cal.4th 482	249, 303
<i>People v. Mai</i> (2013) 57 Cal.4th 986	154, 156, 159
<i>People v. Marshall</i> (1990) 50 Cal.3d 907	312
<i>People v. Marshall</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 799	140
<i>People v. Martinez</i> (2009) 47 Cal.4th 399	131
<i>People v. Martinez</i> (2010) 47 Cal.4th 911	175, 176, 313
<i>People v. McDowell</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 395	279, 280
<i>People v. McKinzie</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 1302	59, 60, 69

<i>People v. McLain</i> (1998) 46 Cal.3d 97.....	311
<i>People v. McWhorter</i> (2009) 47 Cal.4th 318	180, 308
<i>People v. Medina</i> (1995) 11 Cal.4th 694	251
<i>People v. Mickle,</i> (1991) 54 Cal.3d 140	177, 178
<i>People v. Mills</i> (2010) 48 Cal.4th 158.....	passim
<i>People v. Mitchell</i> (1966) 63 Cal.2d 805	238
<i>People v. Mitchell</i> (1986) 183 Cal.App.3d 325.....	197
<i>People v. Moon</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4th 1.....	61
<i>People v. Morgan</i> (2007) 42 Cal.4th 593	308
<i>People v. Mungia</i> (2008) 44 Cal.4th 1101	295
<i>People v. Myles</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1181	296
<i>People v. Navarette</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 458	123, 131
<i>People v. Neal</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 63	181
<i>People v. Nelson</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 367	174, 175, 176
<i>People v. Nesler</i> (1997) 16 Cal.4th 561	passim

<i>People v. Nunez and Satele</i> (2013) 57 Cal.4th 1	120
<i>People v. Ochoa</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1199	194, 243, 283, 284
<i>People v. Ochoa</i> (1998) 19 Cal.4th 353	passim
<i>People v. Ochoa</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4th 398	311
<i>People v. Olguin</i> (1994) 31 Cal.App.4th 1355.....	165, 166
<i>People v. Ortiz</i> (1995) 38 Cal.App.4th 377.....	187, 188
<i>People v. Ortiz</i> (2012) 208 Cal.App.4th 1354	196
<i>People v. Osband</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 622	140, 167
<i>People v. Panah</i> (2005) 35 Cal.4th 395	55, 293, 313
<i>People v. Parmar</i> (2001) 86 Cal.App.4th 781.....	224
<i>People v. Partida</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4th 428	168, 189, 190
<i>People v. Perez</i> (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 856.....	196
<i>People v. Perry</i> (2006) 38 Cal.4th 302	295
<i>People v. Pesinger</i> (1991) 52 Cal.3d 1210	271
<i>People v. Pinholster</i> (1992) 1 Cal.4th 865	207, 213, 271

<i>People v. Pre</i> (2004) 117 Cal.App.4th 413.....	196
<i>People v. Price</i> (1991) 1 Cal.4th 324	202, 205
<i>People v. Pride</i> (1992) 3 Cal.4th 195	46
<i>People v. Prieto</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 226	307
<i>People v. Prince</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4th 1179	45, 53, 54, 165
<i>People v. Proctor</i> (1992) 4 Cal.4th 499	47, 55
<i>People v. Quartermain</i> (1997) 16 Cal.4th 600	253
<i>People v. Raley</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 870	269, 270
<i>People v. Ramirez</i> (2006) 39 Cal.4th 398	46, 49, 50, 55
<i>People v. Ramos</i> (1982) 30 Cal.3d 553	209
<i>People v. Ray</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 313	180, 181
<i>People v. Reyes</i> (1974) 12 Cal.3d 486	271
<i>People v. Reynoso</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 903	154
<i>People v. Riccardi</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 758	189
<i>People v. Riser</i> (1956) 47 Cal.2d 566	209