SUPREME COURT MINUTES MONDAY, AUGUST 8, 2016 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S219052 B245959 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

MONTEBELLO, CITY OF v. VASQUEZ (ROSEMARIE)/ (ARAKELIAN ENTERPRISES, INC.)

Opinion filed: Judgment reversed

We reverse the Court of Appeal's judgment, and remand for further proceedings consistent with the views expressed above.

Majority Opinion by Corrigan, J.

-- joined by Cantil-Sakauye, C. J., Werdegar, Chin, and Cuéllar, JJ.

Concurring and Dissenting Opinion by Liu, J.

-- joined by Kruger, J.

S165894

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Senior Deputy State Public Defender's representation that the appellant's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by May 4, 2017, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to October 4, 2016. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 211 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).)

S174227

PEOPLE v. GUERRERO (JOSE)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel J. Wilder Lee's representation that the appellant's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by January 15, 2017, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to October 4, 2016. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 104 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. PENUELAS (JESUS GUADALUPE VELAZQUEZ)

S181555

Application to file over-length brief denied

The application to file an overlength appellant's opening brief is denied without prejudice to a more specific showing of good cause, based upon the factors enumerated in California Rules of Court, rule 8.631(c). (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.361(d)(3)(B).) Any such renewed application 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).)

S185810

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to October 7, 2016.

S196185

PEOPLE v. MACIAS (ARMANDO)

PEOPLE v. THREATS

(DERLYN RAY)

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to September 30, 2016.

S222187

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Ann Kim's representation that the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is anticipated to be filed by November 7, 2016, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that document is granted to October 7, 2016. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 30 additional days is contemplated.

S226291

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy Attorney General Dana M. Ali's representation that the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is anticipated to be filed by October 4, 2016, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that document is granted to October 4, 2016. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

PEOPLE v. MARTIN (VALERIE DEE)

DANIELS (DAVID SCOTT) ON H.C.

HARRIS (KAI) ON H.C.

S010071

Order filed

Because appellant is represented by counsel, the Clerk is directed to return to appellant the pro se submissions received on May 11, 2016, May 23, 2016, July 11, 2016, and July 18, 2016. (*In re Barnett* (2003) 31 Cal.4th 466.)

S045184

Order filed

Because appellant is represented by counsel, the Clerk is directed to return to appellant the pro se submissions received on April 8, 2016, April 26, 2016, May 4, 2016, May 5, 2016, May 23, 2016, June 3, 2016, June 6, 2016, June 8, 2016, June 10, 2016, June 27, 2016, and July 12, 2016. (*In re Barnett* (2003) 31 Cal.4th 466.)

S236248

BROWN (JAMIE ANTONIO) v. s.c. (PEOPLE)

PEOPLE v. BROWN, JR., (ALBERT GREENWOOD)

PEOPLE v. BONILLA

(STEVEN WAYNE)

Transferred to Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District

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



SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR SAN FRANCISCO SESSION SEPTEMBER 7 and 8, 2016

FIRST AMENDED

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 September 7 and 8, 2016.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2016 — 9:00 A.M.

(1)	Kesner, Jr. (Johnny Blaine) v. Superior Court of AlamedaCounty (Pneumo Abex LLC, Real Party in Interest), S219534 and Haver (Joshua) et al. v. BNSF Railway Company, S219919 (consolidated cases)
(2)	Augustus (Jennifer) et al. v. ABM Security Services, Inc., S224853 (To be called and continued to the September 29, 2016 calendar.)
(3)	Maas (Michael Eugene) v. Superior Court of San Diego County (People, Real Party in Interest), S225109
(4)	Horiike (Hiroshi) v. Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage Company et al., S218734
<u>1:30 P.M.</u>	
(5)	People v. Thompson (Catherine) [Automatic Appeal], S033901
(6)	People v. Williams (George) [Automatic Appeal], S131819
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2016 — 9:00 A.M.	
(7)	Centinela Freeman Emergency Medical Associates et al. v. Health Net of California, Inc. et al., S218497

(8) People v. Winbush (Grayland) [Automatic Appeal], S117489

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).)