



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. 16/06**

Release Date: **April 21, 2006**

Summary of Cases Accepted During the Week of April 17, 2006

[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.]

#06-41 *In re Roberto A., S142280.* (B177872; unpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; PJ34850.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed orders in a wardship proceeding.

#06-42 *In re Jesus O., S140865.* (B177869; 135 Cal.App.4th 237; Los Angeles County Superior Court; PJ34851.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal modified and affirmed orders in a wardship proceeding.

Roberto A. and *Jesus O.* both present the following issue: Is the crime of grand theft *from the person* committed when an assault causes the victim to drop his or her property and the perpetrator takes the property after the victim flees?

#06-43 *Beal Bank, SSB v. Arter & Hadden, LLP, S141131.* (135 Cal.App.4th 643; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC308535.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Is the limitations period for a legal malpractice claim tolled as to an attorney's former law firm while the attorney continues to represent the client in the same subject matter at his or her new firm?

#06-44 *Metropolitan Water Dist. v. Campus Crusade for Christ, Inc., S141148.* (E034248; 135 Cal.App.4th 568; San Bernardino County Superior Court; SCV35498.) Petition for review after the Court of

(over)

Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents issues concerning the burden of proof and the relative roles of the judge and the jury in eminent domain actions.

DISPOSITIONS

People v. Alexander, S131621, an automatic appeal, was abated upon the death of the appellant.

The following case was transferred to the Court of Appeal for reconsideration in light of *People v. Smith* (2006) 37 Cal.4th 733:

#05-197 *People v. Anzalone*, S135646.

Review in the following case was dismissed in light of *People v. Smith* (2006) 37 Cal.4th 733:

#04-143 *People v. Oates*, S128181.

STATUS

#06-10 *Elkins v. Superior Court*, S139073. The court requested the Family Law Section of the Contra Costa County Bar Association and the Association of Certified Family Law Specialists to file amicus curiae briefs addressing the issues presented by this case.