



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF
CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS
Public Information Office
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
www.courtinfo.ca.gov

415-865-7740

Lynn Holton
Public Information Officer

NEWS RELEASE

Release Number: **S.C. 01/07**

Release Date: **January 8, 2007**

Summary of Cases Accepted During the Week of January 1, 2007

[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The statement of the issue or issues in each case set out below does not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#07-01 *People v. Cuevas, S147510.* (B168269; 142 Cal.App.4th 1141; Los Angeles County Superior Court; LA040073.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal remanded for resentencing and otherwise affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issues: (1) Was defendant required to obtain a certificate of probable cause in order to claim on appeal that the sentence imposed violated Penal Code section 654, when he entered his no contest plea with an understanding of the maximum sentence he faced although the plea agreement did not specify a maximum sentence? (2) Does rule 4.412(b) of the California Rules of Court bar defendant from challenging his sentence under Penal Code section 654 in such circumstances?

#07-02 *Hernandez v. Hillsides, Inc., S147552.* (B183713; 142 Cal.App.4th 1377; Los Angeles County Superior Court; GC032633.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: May employees assert a cause of action for invasion of privacy when their employer installed a hidden surveillance camera in the office to investigate whether someone was using an office computer for improper purposes, only operated the camera after normal working hours, and did not actually capture any video of the employees who worked in the office?

(over)

DISPOSITIONS

Review in the following case was dismissed in light of *In re Jaime P.* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 128:

#06-24 In re Jose S., S139601.

Review in the following case was dismissed in light of the parties' settlement and with directions for further proceedings in the superior court related to consideration of the class settlement:

#06-109 WFS Financial, Inc. v. Superior Court, S145304.

#