



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. 17/09**

Release Date: **May 1, 2009**

Summary of Cases Accepted During the Week of April 27, 2009

[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.]

#09-19 *People v. Anderson, S170778.* (D050432; 170 Cal.App.4th 910; San Diego County Superior Court; SCE262419.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. The court limited review to the following issue: Did the trial court err in awarding restitution to the hospital that treated the victim of defendant's hit-and-run offense?

#09-20 *Lu v. Hawaiian Garden Casinos, S171442.* (B194209; 170 Cal.App.4th 466, mod. 170 Cal.App.4th 1370a; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC286164.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part the judgment in a civil action. The court limited review to the following issue: Does Labor Code section 351, which prohibits employers from taking "any gratuity or part thereof that is paid, given to, or left for an employee by a patron," create a private right of action for employees?

#09-21 *In re Zamudio Jimenez, S167100.* Original proceeding. In this case, which is related to the automatic appeal in *People v. Zamudio* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 327, the Court ordered briefing in relation to respondent's Motion for Order to Show Cause addressing why under applicable principles of California law, the court should deny petitioner's requests to defer informal briefing on the petition filed on September 29, 2008, and to stay further proceedings in this matter until June 28, 2010, or the filing of an amended petition for writ of habeas corpus, whichever is earlier, and why the court instead should summarily deny the petition.

#09-22 *In re Morgan*, S162413. Original proceeding. In this case, which is related to the automatic appeal in *People v. Morgan* (2007) 42 Cal.4th 593, the Court ordered briefing in relation to respondent's Motion for Order to Show Cause addressing why, under applicable principles of California law, the court should deny petitioner's requests to permit petitioner to amend the petition within 36 months after the appointment of habeas corpus counsel to include additional claims as determined by habeas corpus counsel, and to defer informal briefing on the petition filed on April 9, 2008, until 36 months after the appointment of habeas corpus counsel, and why the court instead should summarily deny the petition.

#