[NO MINUTES WERE GENERATED FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 2020.]

556

SUPREME COURT MINUTES WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2020 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S251333 F073942 Fifth Appellate District

PEOPLE v. McKENZIE (DOUGLAS EDWARD)

Rehearing denied

S165195

PEOPLE v. NAVARRO (ANTHONY)

Supplemental briefing ordered

The parties are directed to serve and file supplemental briefs addressing the following questions: Was expert testimony that is excludable under *People v. Sanchez* (2016) 63 Cal.4th 665 (*Sanchez*) admitted at defendant's trial?

If so, can the admission of such evidence be asserted as a ground for reversal in this appeal (see, e.g., *People v. Perez* (2020) 9 Cal.5th 1)?

Assuming affirmative answers to the first two questions, was the admission of such testimony prejudicial to defendant?

The parties' supplemental briefs addressing the above questions must be served and filed on or before May 20, 2020. Any reply by the parties to the supplemental briefs must be served and filed on or before June 3, 2020.

S260740 C085063 Third Appellate District

PEOPLE v. COLLINS (ROBERT T.)

Petition for review granted; briefing deferred

The petition for review is granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of a related issue in *People v. Bryant*, S259956 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court. Submission of additional briefing, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.520, is deferred pending further order of the court. Votes: Cantil-Sakauye, C. J., Chin, Corrigan, Liu, Cuéllar, Kruger, and Groban, JJ.

S260780 B280357 Second Appellate District, Div. 7 PEOPLE v. MAGANA (WUENDY M.)

Petition for review granted; briefing deferred

The petitions for review are granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of a related issue in *People v. Bryant*, S259956 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court. Submission of additional briefing, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.520, is deferred pending further order of the court. The request for an order directing publication of the opinion is denied.

Votes: Cantil-Sakauye, C. J., Chin, Corrigan, Liu, Cuéllar, Kruger, and Groban, JJ.

S261029 C087771 Third Appellate District

PEOPLE v. GAMBOA (RALPH HUERTA)

Petition for review granted; briefing deferred

The petition for review is granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of a related issue in *People v. Lopez*, S258175 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court. Submission of additional briefing, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.520, is deferred pending further order of the court. Votes: Cantil-Sakauye, C. J., Chin, Corrigan, Liu, Cuéllar, Kruger, and Groban, JJ.

S261087 B289019 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 PEOPLE v. MELARA (OSKAR ANTHONY)

Petition for review granted; briefing deferred

The petition for review is granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of related issues in *People v. Tirado*, S257658 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court. Submission of additional briefing, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.520, is deferred pending further order of the court. Votes: Cantil-Sakauye, C. J., Chin, Corrigan, Liu, Cuéllar, Kruger, and Groban, JJ.

S261098 G056524 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3 PEOPLE v. STONE (ADAM JAY)

Petition for review granted; briefing deferred

The petition for review is granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of a related issue in *People v. Frahs*, S252220 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court. Submission of additional briefing, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.520, is deferred pending further order of the court. Votes: Cantil-Sakauye, C. J., Chin, Corrigan, Liu, Cuéllar, Kruger, and Groban, JJ.

S261295 H045521 Sixth Appellate District

PEOPLE v. SHEPPARD (MICHAEL OLIVER)

Petition for review granted; briefing deferred

The petition for review is granted. Further action in this matter is deferred pending consideration and disposition of a related issue in *People v. Frahs*, S252220 (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2)), or pending further order of the court. Submission of additional briefing, pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.520, is deferred pending further order of the court. Votes: Cantil-Sakauye, C. J., Chin, Corrigan, Liu, Cuéllar, Kruger, and Groban, JJ.

S200464

SELF (CHRISTOPHER) ON H.C.

Order to show cause issued, returnable in Superior Court

This petition for writ of habeas corpus was filed in this court on March 1, 2012, before the effective date of Proposition 66, the "Death Penalty Reform and Savings Act of 2016." (See *Briggs v. Brown* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 808, 862, rehg. den. Oct. 25, 2017.) Under section 1509, subdivision (g) of the Penal Code, the court exercises its authority to retain this petition and decide it.

Respondent's request for judicial notice, filed October 4, 2012, is granted.

The Secretary of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation is ordered to show cause in the Superior Court of California, County of Riverside, when the matter is placed on calendar, why the relief prayed for should not be granted on the ground that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance of counsel at the penalty phase of the trial because counsel was law partners with the attorney representing codefendant Orlando Gene Romero, as alleged in Claim 2.C. The return is to be filed on or before May 29, 2020.

All remaining claims in the petition are denied on the merits, except Claims 21 and 22, which are denied as premature and without prejudice to renewal after an execution date is set. Claims 6 (except to the extent it alleges the prosecutor failed to disclose favorable evidence concerning Munoz's plea agreement) and 10 (to the extent it alleges the trial court erred in failing to instruct that victim impact evidence must be proven unanimously and beyond a reasonable doubt) are procedurally barred to the extent they could have been, but were not, raised on appeal. (*In re Dixon* (1953) 41 Cal.2d 756, 759; see also *In re Reno* (2012) 55 Cal.4th 428, 443, 490-496.) Claims 1 and 4 (except to the extent they allege ineffective assistance of counsel) are procedurally barred because petitioner failed to preserve the claims at trial. (*In re Seaton* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 193, 199-200.)

Votes: Cantil-Sakauye, C. J., Liu, Cuéllar, Kruger, and Groban, JJ.

SMITH (JIMMY) ON H.C.

Order to show cause issued; returnable in Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three

The Secretary of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation is ordered to show cause before the Second District Court of Appeal, Division Three, when the matter is placed on calendar, why petitioner is not entitled to relief based on his claim that there was insufficient evidence to support the robbery-murder special circumstance finding under *People v. Clark* (2016) 63 Cal.4th 522, 609-623 and *People v. Banks* (2015) 61 Cal.4th 788.

Votes: Cantil-Sakauye, C. J., Chin, Corrigan, Liu, Cuéllar, Kruger, and Groban, JJ.

S261111 B301891 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 **WOODS (ANDRE) ON H.C.** Petition for review granted; transferred to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District. Division One, with directions to issue an order to show cause

The petition for review is granted. The matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District. Division One, with directions to vacate its February 18, 2020, order denying the petition for writ of habeas corpus, and to issue an order directing the Secretary of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to show cause why petitioner should not be entitled to relief on the grounds that the failure to provide him with a youth offender hearing violates his right to equal protection of the laws under the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution and his right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment under the Eighth Amendment to the federal Constitution. (See *People v. Contreras* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 349, 382; *People v. Edwards* (2019) 34 Cal.App.5th 183.)

Votes: Cantil-Sakauye, C. J., Chin, Corrigan, Liu, Cuéllar, Kruger, and Groban, JJ.

S197824

ROMERO (ORLANDO GENE) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied (AA)

This petition for writ of habeas corpus was filed in this court on November 9, 2011, before the effective date of Proposition 66, the "Death Penalty Reform and Savings Act of 2016." (See *Briggs v. Brown et al.* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 808, 862.) Under section 1509, subdivision (g) of the Penal Code, the court exercises its authority to retain this petition and decide it. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

All claims are denied on the merits, except: Claim 4, to the extent it challenges the sufficiency of the trial evidence, which is denied as not cognizable on habeas corpus (*In re Lindley* (1947) 29 Cal.2d 709, 723); Claim 11, which is denied as premature and without prejudice to renewal after an execution date is set; and Claim 14, which is not cognizable on habeas corpus. To the extent Claim 14 requests joinder of the claims presented in codefendant Christopher Self's habeas corpus petition, S200464, the request is denied.

Claim 3 (except insofar as it relies on evidence obtained at Jose Munoz's 2004 postconviction

coram nobis proceedings and except to the extent it alleges the prosecutor committed misconduct in arguing future dangerousness) is procedurally barred because it could have been, but was not, raised on appeal. (*In re Dixon* (1953) 41 Cal.2d 756, 759; see also *In re Reno* (2012) 55 Cal.4th 428, 443, 490-496.)

Claim 3 (to the extent it alleges the prosecutor committed misconduct in arguing future dangerousness) is procedurally barred because it was raised and rejected on appeal. (*In re Waltreus* (1965) 62 Cal.2d 218, 225; see also *In re Reno, supra*, 55 Cal.4th at pp. 476-490.) Claim 5 (except to the extent it alleges ineffective assistance of counsel) is procedurally barred because petitioner failed to preserve the claim at trial. (*In re Seaton* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 193, 199-200.)

S260698 B303579 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 WOODS (ANDRE LAMONT) ON H.C.

The petition for review is denied. (See *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767-769 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are successive].)

S260764 G056520 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3 PEOPLE v. HANRAHAN (DAVID EUGENE)

Petition for review denied

S260807 E070658 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 PEOPLE v. MORALES (HIPOLITO OSORIO)

Petition for review denied

S260817 B291732 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 PEOPLE v. RUIZ (FRANK)

Petition for review denied

S260832 C088019 Third Appellate District 6492 FLORIN PERKINS

ROAD LLC v. GALLETTA

(BRIAN)

Petition for review denied

S260845 H045077 Sixth Appellate District MHANNA (FIDA) & HAGE

(GHASSAN), MARRIAGE OF

S260878 D074742 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 PEOPLE v. COSINERO (JUAN)

Petition for review denied

S260908 B295698 Second Appellate District, Div. 5 PEOPLE v. VASQUEZ (WILMAR)

Petition for review denied

S260938 B291736 Second Appellate District, Div. 3 PEOPLE v. SANCHEZ (ISRAEL)

Petition for review denied

S260941 B286431 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 PEOPLE v. PEDROZA (JOSEFINA)

The petition for review is denied without prejudice to any relief to which defendant might be entitled after this court decides *People v. Kopp*, S257844.

S260948 B288656 Second Appellate District, Div. 7 SIMON (SELMA V.), ESTATE OF

Petition for review denied

S260981 E069732 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 PEOPLE v. JOHNSON (TAJAY MARCELL)

Petitions for review denied

Liu, J., is of the opinion appellant Johnson's petition should be granted as to the 1st issue.

S260991 C082954 Third Appellate District PEOPLE v. DAVIS, JR., (LOVE)

Petition for review denied

S260993 B290282 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 PEOPLE v. MURRAY (CLAY MARTIN RUPT)

MARTIN BURT)

S261005 B291147 Second Appellate District, Div. 3 PEOPLE v. ROONEY (JOSEPH WILLIAM) Petition for review denied S261006 B281406 Second Appellate District, Div. 7 SMOLKER (GARY) v. W.R. GRACE & CO. Petition for review denied PEOPLE v. PETTIS S261014 H044945 Sixth Appellate District (MICHAEL EARL) Petition for review denied S261038 B298165 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **MURRAY (CLAY MARTIN BURT) ON H.C.** Petition for review denied E074430 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 S261048 SAN JACINTO, CITY OF v. S.C. (PRUDENCIO) Petition for review denied S261053 A159728 First Appellate District, Div. 5 RODRIGUEZ (LESLIE) v. S.C. (ALAMEDA COUNTY JAIL **OF SANTA RITA)** Petition for review denied S261062 C085354 Third Appellate District **PEOPLE v. TITMAN (JAMES)** Petition for review denied S261066 B296480 Second Appellate District, Div. 6 **JONES (CRAIG DWAYNE)** ON H.C. Petition for review denied

S261084 C081972 Third Appellate District PEOPLE v. WILMER, JR., (CHRISTOPHER DEXTER)

D076199 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 S261097 PEOPLE v. KHAN (SHAZAD MOHAMMAD) Petition for review denied S261107 E071464 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 PEOPLE v. VALADEZ (ANTHONY CIENFUEGOS) Petition for review denied **JORDAN (ANTOINE** S261144 B298230 Second Appellate District, Div. 8 DENELL) ON H.C. The request for judicial notice is granted. The petition for review is denied. S261243 H047699 Sixth Appellate District DAVIS (KENNARD LEE) ON H.C. Petition for review denied S261252 D075826 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 PEOPLE v. FLORES (FALLON LUPE) Petition for review & depublication request(s) denied E073835 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 S261278 **GUTIERREZ (MICHAEL** ANTHONY) ON H.C. The request for judicial notice is granted. The petition for review is denied. G056969 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3 S261350 PEOPLE v. VIZCARRA (ANDRES) Petition for review denied S261357 A152964 First Appellate District, Div. 3 PEOPLE v. HERNANDEZ-

HERNANDEZ (HECTOR

ALONZO)

S261358 C090784 Third Appellate District MASON (STANLEY) ON H.C.

Petition for review denied

S261367 B304635 Second Appellate District, Div. 2 NEW YORK MARINE &

GENERAL INSURANCE CO. v. S.C. (FANCY CONTENT,

INC.)

(CHRISTINA)

Petition for review & application for stay denied

S261368 B295280 Second Appellate District, Div. 2 PEOPLE v. BETMALECK (MARK EDGAR)

The petition for review is denied without prejudice to any relief to which defendant might be entitled after this court decides *People v. Kopp*, S257844.

S261412 E070460 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 PEOPLE v. TRIGEROS (JOSEPH BURT)

Petition for review denied

S261414 B304743 Second Appellate District, Div. 5 GARY (REGINALD A.) ON

H.C. Petition for review denied

S261420 D074317 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 PEOPLE v. DANIEL

Petition for review denied

S261459 D077373 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1 THOMAS (KEITH PERZELL)

ON H.C.

Petition for review denied

S261588 WATERS (MICHAEL LYNN)

v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

Petition for writ of mandate/prohibition denied

DOSSEY (JAY RYLAND) ON

H.C.

The request for judicial notice is granted. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

S258293

LYLES (SCOTT) ON H.C.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence].)

S258613

KURBEGOVICH (MUHAREM) ON H.C.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely]; *In re Miller* (1941) 17 Cal.2d 734, 735 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are repetitive].)

S258702

HARMON (DEVIN

MAURICE) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S259147

POVADORA (ALBERT) ON

H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S259151

WHIPPLE (JAMES

RICHARD) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S259270

OREILEY (DAKOTAH) ON

H.C.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied without prejudice to any relief to which petitioner might be entitled after this court decides *People v. Raybon*, S256978.

S259565

DAWSON (KENNETH DEAN)

ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S259720 ALMEDA (MICHAEL) ON

H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S259810 BARNES (ROBERT ANTONIO) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S259814 NELSON (FLOYD HILLS) ON

H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S260031 ALVE (ALEJANDRO) ON

H.C.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied without prejudice to any relief to which petitioner might be entitled after this court decides *In re Palmer*, S256149.

S260038 OGILVIE (ANTHONY WILLIAM) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S260052 ADAMS (DEREK

CHRISTOPHER) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S260057 HENDERSON (CARLTON WILLIAM) ON H.C.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Waltreus* (1965) 62 Cal.2d 218, 225 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that were rejected on appeal]; *In re Dixon* (1953) 41 Cal.2d 756, 759 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that could have been, but were not, raised on appeal].)

S260088 VICTORY (MICHAEL ANTHONY) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S260184 THAO (TOU C.) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S260235 JOHN DOE I ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S260239 JOHN DOE II ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S260358 GARCIA (PETE BRIAN) ON

H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S260368 BRUMFIELD (PAUL RANDOLF) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S260414 BLANCO (MICHAEL) ON H.C.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely]; *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767-769 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are successive]; *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must include copies of reasonably available documentary evidence]; *In re Dixon* (1953) 41 Cal.2d 756, 759 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that could have been, but were not, raised on appeal]; *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304 [a petition for writ of habeas corpus must allege sufficient facts with particularity].)

S260415 PARKER (ROY L.) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S260452 HERRING (DION ISAAC) ON H.C.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. Individual claims are denied, as applicable: (See *In re Dixon* (1953) 41 Cal.2d 756, 759 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that could have been, but were not, raised on appeal]; *In re Lindley* (1947) 29 Cal.2d 709, 723 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that attack the sufficiency of the evidence]; *In re Miller* (1941)

17 Cal.2d 734, 735 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are repetitive].)

S260453 AZEVEDO (ALEX LEONARD) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S260454 WILLIAMS, JR., (CEDRIC DALE) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S260460 McLAURIN (RUFUS JONATHAN) ON H.C.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely]; *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767-769 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are successive]; *In re Dixon* (1953) 41 Cal.2d 756, 759 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that could have been, but were not, raised on appeal].)

S260461 WATKINS (DAVID) ON H.C.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely]; *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767-769 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are successive].)

S260485 AMMA (L. AMIR ANTHONY VARICK) ON H.C.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Dexter* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 921, 925-926 [a habeas corpus petitioner must exhaust available administrative remedies].)

S260496 ESPINOSA (CUSTODIO) ON

H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S260505 RAY, JR., (EDWARD VINCENT) ON H.C.

Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied

S260705 B298106 Second Appellate District, Div. 5 IN RE P.G.

Publication request denied (case closed)

S260799 B293881 Second Appellate District, Div. 8 PEOPLE v. TAYLOR (ISAAC

WILLIAM)

Depublication request denied (case closed)

The request for an order directing depublication of the opinion in the above-entitled appeal is denied. The court declines to review this matter on its own motion. The matter is now final.

S261039 B295943 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 **DUNN (JULIA) v. GARFIELD BEACH CVS, LLC**

Publication requests denied (case closed)

S261043 B261814/B263950 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 DANIEL (PIERRE) v. WAYANS (MARLON)

Publication request denied (case closed)

S261074 G056427 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 3 TUTTLE (GRANT) v.

HEAVENLY VALLEY, L.P.

Publication request denied (case closed)

S107900 PEOPLE v. WRIGHT, JR., (WILLIAM LEE)

Extension of time granted

Based upon Senior Deputy State Public Defender Alison Bernstein's representation that the supplemental appellant's reply brief is anticipated to be filed by August 25, 2020, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to June 26, 2020. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 59 additional days is contemplated.

PEOPLE v. SNYDER (JANEEN MARIE) & THORNTON (MICHAEL FORREST)

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Tracy J. Dressner's representation that appellant Janeen Marie Snyder's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by December 24, 2020, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to June 23, 2020. After that date, only three further extensions totaling about 183 additional days are contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S195828

PEOPLE v. VILLA (RICARDO)

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Stephen M. Lathrop's representation that the appellant's reply brief is anticipated to be filed by July 15, 2020, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to June 22, 2020. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 24 additional days is contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S202630

PEOPLE v. BUTLER (RAYMOND OSCAR)

Extension of time granted

Based upon Supervising Deputy State Public Defender Ryan R. Davis's representation that the appellant's reply brief is anticipated to be filed by December 31, 2020, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to June 30, 2020. After that date, only three further extensions totaling about 185 additional days are contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

PEOPLE v. ESPINOZA (PEDRO)

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Debra S. Sabah Press's representation that the appellant's reply brief is anticipated to be filed by July 31, 2020, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to June 26, 2020. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 34 additional days is contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S210054

PEOPLE v. CERVANTES (DANIEL) & CONTRERAS (CARLOS)

Application to file over-length brief granted

Good cause appearing, appellant Daniel Cervantes's "Application for Leave to File Appellant's Opening Brief of No More Than 8000 words in Excess of Word Count Limit Established in Rule 8.630(b) of the California Rules of Court," filed on April 23, 2020, is granted. Appellant Cervantes's opening brief must not exceed 110,000 words.

S211060

PEOPLE v. GALVAN (ROBERT)

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to July 6, 2020.

S212030

PEOPLE v. PEREZ (JOHN MICHAEL) & RUIZ (RUDY ANTHONY)

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant Rudy Ruiz, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to June 29, 2020.

PEOPLE v. PEREZ (JOHN MICHAEL) & RUIZ (RUDY ANTHONY)

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant John Michael Perez, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to June 29, 2020.

S214846

SATELE (WILLIAM TUPUA) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Robert M. Sanger's representation that the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is anticipated to be filed by July 27, 2020, an extension of time in which to serve and file that document is granted to June 26, 2020. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 30 additional days is contemplated.

S216466

PEOPLE v. BALCOM (JASON MICHAEL)

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Stephen M. Lathrop's representation that the appellant's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by August 10, 2020, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to June 26, 2020. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 44 additional days is contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S219152

PEOPLE v. NISSENSOHN (JOSEPH MICHAEL)

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Mark D. Greenberg's representation that the appellant's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by August 1, 2020, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to June 29, 2020. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 34 additional days is contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

PEOPLE v. NEALY (EDDIE RICKY)

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to June 22, 2020.

S256659 B268380/B271185 Second Appellate District, Div. 8 HAN (SUNNIE H.) v. HALLBERG, JR., (RICHARD)

Extension of time granted

On application of plaintiffs and appellants and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply brief on the merits is extended to May 27, 2020.

S258912 A152748 First Appellate District, Div. 1 LOPEZ (RICO RICARDO) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the opening brief on the merits is extended to May 29, 2020.

No further extensions are contemplated.

S259215 D072863 Fourth Appellate District, Div. 1

McHUGH (BLAKELY) v. PROTECTIVE LIFE INSURANCE

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the opening brief on the merits is extended to May 29, 2020. No further extensions are contemplated.

S259216 B280550 Second Appellate District, Div. 7 BROWN (YAZMIN) v. USA TAEKWONDO

Extension of time granted

On application of appellants and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the opening brief on the merits is extended to May 15, 2020. No further extensions of time are contemplated.

S259523 A150863 First Appellate District, Div. 3

HANDOUSH (ZEAAD) v. LEASE FINANCE GROUP, LLC

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the opening brief on the merits is extended to June 25, 2020.

S260063 C077558 Third Appellate District

PEOPLE v. CARNEY (JAMES LEO)

Extension of time granted

On application of appellants Lonnie Orlando and Louis James Mitchell and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the opening brief on the merits is extended to May 26, 2020.

S261007 A153511 First Appellate District, Div. 2

JENSEN (GARTH) v. iSHARES TRUST

Extension of time granted

On application of plaintiffs and appellants and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply to answer to petition for review is extended to May 11, 2020.

S261509 B304779 Second Appellate District, Div. 8

SPENGLER (MICHAEL R.) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

Extension of time granted

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply brief on the merits is extended to May 13, 2020.

S259969

PEOPLE v. SAHINIAN (EDWARD)

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Megan Hailey-Dunsheath is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S260598 B295998 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 PEOPLE v. LEWIS (VINCE E.)
Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, Robert Bacon is hereby appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

Appellant's brief on the merits must be served and filed on or before thirty (30) days from the date of this order.

S098318

PEOPLE v. HENDERSON (PAUL NATHAN)

Motion for judicial notice granted

Respondent Attorney General's request to take judicial notice filed on March 21, 2013, is granted. Appellant Paul Nathan Henderson's request to take judicial notice filed on July 1, 2014, is denied. Appellant's request to take judicial notice filed on April 3, 2020, is granted as to Exhibit A only, the death certificate of Thomas Newton Douglass, Jr.. The remainder of the request is denied.

S101247

PEOPLE v. VARGAS (EDUARDO DAVID)

Motion denied

The request to file an Application for Permission to File Overlength Appellant's Supplemental Opening Brief is denied.

S252915 C082664 Third Appellate District

WILDE (LESLIE T.) v. CITY OF DUNSMUIR

Order filed

The request of respondents to allocate to amici curiae the Association of California Water Agencies, California Association of Sanitation Agencies, California State Association of Counties, California Special Districts Association, and League of California Cities 20 minutes of respondents' 30-minute allotted time for oral argument is granted.

S261836 A159949 First Appellate District, Div. 2

HOWERTON (JEFFREY) v. S.C. (SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT ATTORNEY)

Request for accommodations per Rule 1.100 denied

S261842 HOWERTON (JEFFREY) v.

S.C. (SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT ATTORNEY)

Request for accommodations per Rule 1.100 denied

S261741 H. (K.) v. S.C. (SACRAMENTO

COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF CHILD, FAMILY & ADULT

SERVICES)

Transferred to Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District

The above-entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District.

S261755 DICKSON (WILLIAM) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

Transferred to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District

The above-entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition must be denied.

S260893 ACCUSATION OF GRIFFIN

Petition denied (accusation)

S261276 ACCUSATION OF NAJLE-

RAHIM

Petition denied (accusation)

S261427 ACCUSATION OF

ESCAMILLA

Petition denied (accusation)

S261428 ACCUSATION OF DUBUNI

Petition denied (accusation)

RODRIGUEZ ON DISCIPLINE

Recommended discipline imposed

The court orders that PATRICIA RENEE RODRIGUEZ (Respondent), State Bar Number 270639, is suspended from the practice of law in California for one year, execution of that period of suspension is stayed, and Respondent is placed on probation for one year subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for the first 30 days of probation;
- 2. Respondent must comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Review Department of the State Bar Court in its Opinion filed on January 13, 2020 and as modified on February 14, 2020; and
- 3. At the expiration of the period of probation, if Respondent has complied with all conditions of probation, the period of stayed suspension will be satisfied, and that suspension will be terminated.

Respondent must provide to the State Bar's Office of Probation proof of taking and passing the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination as recommended by the Review Department in its Opinion filed on January 13, 2020, and as modified on February 14, 2020. Failure to do so may result in suspension. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 9.10(b).)

Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

S260901

SALOMON ON DISCIPLINE

Recommended discipline imposed: disbarred

The court orders that ROBERT MICHAEL SALOMON (Respondent), State Bar Number 194660, is disbarred from the practice of law in California and that Respondent's name is stricken from the roll of attorneys.

Respondent must also comply with California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.

Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

PARTINGTON ON DISCIPLINE

Recommended discipline imposed: disbarred

The court orders that EARLE ARTHUR PARTINGTON (Respondent), State Bar Number 45731, is disbarred from the practice of law in California and that Respondent's name is stricken from the roll of attorneys.

Respondent must comply with California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.

Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

S256601

BHARDWAJ ON DISCIPLINE

Request for rehearing of State Bar discipline denied – SANJAY BHARDWAJ

The Motion for a New Trial and/or Alternative Relief filed January 16, 2020, is denied. The clerk of this court is directed to file the Motion to Dismiss submitted to this court on July 3, 2019. The Motion to Dismiss is denied.

The Petition for Rehearing is denied.

S261863

KRETZ ON RESIGNATION

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of NANCY LOU KRETZ, State Bar Number 212367, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S261864

LEE ON RESIGNATION

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of ANNE W. LEE, State Bar Number 234498, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S261865

LOPER ON RESIGNATION

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of BRUCE P. LOPER, State Bar Number 66632, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

LOVE ON RESIGNATION

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of DAVIA MARJORIE LOVE, State Bar Number 77231, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S261869

MARTINEAU ON RESIGNATION

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of MARIE LENORE MARTINEAU, State Bar Number 109561, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S261871

MILLER ON RESIGNATION

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of PATRICIA IRENE BONE MILLER, State Bar Number 184861, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S261873

MILLER, JR., ON RESIGNATION

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of RAYMOND ARTHUR MILLER, JR., State Bar Number 127212, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S261874

O'HARA ON RESIGNATION

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of MARGARET O'HARA, State Bar Number 79405, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

S261877

OLDHAM ON RESIGNATION

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of NINA DAVIS OLDHAM, State Bar Number 99594, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

RALPHS ON RESIGNATION

Voluntary resignation accepted

The court orders that the voluntary resignation of JoANN M. RALPHS, State Bar Number 110166, as an attorney of the State Bar of California is accepted.

BAR MISC. 4186 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF THE COMMITTEE OF BAR EXAMINERS OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA FOR ADMISSION OF ATTORNEYS (MOTION NO. 1,464)

The written motion of the Committee of Bar Examiners that the following named applicants, who have fulfilled the requirements for admission to practice law in the State of California, be admitted to the practice of law in this state is hereby granted, with permission to the applicants to take the oath before a competent officer at another time and place:

(SEE ORIGINAL APPLICATION FOR THE LIST OF NAMES ATTACHED.)

BAR MISC. 4186 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF THE COMMITTEE OF BAR EXAMINERS OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA FOR ADMISSION OF ATTORNEYS (MOTION NO. 1,466)

The written motion of the Committee of Bar Examiners that the following named applicants, who have fulfilled the requirements for admission to practice law in the State of California, be admitted to the practice of law in this state is hereby granted, with permission to the applicants to take the oath before a competent officer at another time and place:

(SEE ORIGINAL APPLICATION FOR THE LIST OF NAMES ATTACHED.)



SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR SAN FRANCISCO SESSION MAY 19 and 20, 2020

Due to the COVID-19 coronavirus pandemic and related public health directives from state and local authorities, the procedures specified by Administrative Orders Nos. 2020-3-13 (Mar. 16, 2020) and 2020-03-27 (March 27, 2020) apply. Counsel will appear remotely and courtroom seating for the press will be strictly limited to achieve appropriate distancing. The public will continue to have access to argument via live-streaming on the judicial branch website: http://www.courts.ca.gov/.

The following cases are placed upon the calendar of the Supreme Court for hearing at its courtroom in the Ronald M. George State Office Complex, Earl Warren Building, 350 McAllister Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California, on May 19 and 20, 2020.

TUESDAY, MAY 19, 2020 — 9:00 A.M.

- (1) Jarman (Janice) v. HCR ManorCare, Inc., et al., S241431
- (2) Facebook, Inc. v. Superior Court of San Diego County (Lance Touchstone, Real Party in Interest), S245203
- (3) Kirzhner (Allen) v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC, S246444

1:30 P.M.

- (4) Robinson (Julius M.) v. Lewis (G.W.), S228137
- (5) Conservatorship of the Person of O.B., S254938
- (6) People v. Anderson (Vernon), S253227

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 2020 — 9:00 A.M.

- (7) People v. Henderson (Paul Nathan), [Automatic Appeal], S098318
- (8) People v. Silveria (Daniel Todd) and Travis (John Raymond), [Automatic Appeal], S062417
- (9) People v. Suarez (Arturo Juarez), [Automatic Appeal], S105876 (To be called and continued to a future oral argument calendar.)

CANTIL-SAKAUYE	
Chief Justice	

If exhibits are to be transmitted to this court, counsel must apply to the court for permission. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.224(c).)