

The time for ordering review on the court's own motion is hereby extended to May 6, 2019. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(c).)

## Extension of time granted

Based upon Deputy Attorney General William N. Frank's representation that the respondent's brief is anticipated to be filed by May 17, 2019, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to May 17, 2019. After that date, no further extension 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).)

**S206515** **PEOPLE v. MILLS (DAVID)**  
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 May 14, 2019.

### Extension of time granted

On application of appellant Tyrone Miller, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to May 14, 2019.

**S212376****PEOPLE v. JOHN (EMRYS  
JUSTIN) & MILLER  
(TYRONE L.)**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant Emrys J. John, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to May 14, 2019.

**S217284****JONES (BRYAN MAURICE)  
ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted

Based upon counsel Shelley J. Sandusky's representation that the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is anticipated to be filed by December 13, 2019, an extension of time in which to serve and file that document is granted to May 14, 2019. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 212 additional days are contemplated.

**S224408****PEOPLE v. RAMIREZ  
(RICHARD RAYMOND)**

Extension of time granted

Based upon Deputy Attorney General Kathryn Kirschbaum's representation that the respondent's brief is anticipated to be filed by May 20, 2019, an extension of time in which to serve and file that brief is granted to May 20, 2019. After that date, no further extension 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).)

**S249248****WHITE (ROBERT E.) v.  
SQUARE, INC.**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the response to the amicus curiae briefs is extended to April 15, 2019.

**S251333**

F073942 Fifth Appellate District

**PEOPLE v. McKENZIE  
(DOUGLAS EDWARD)**

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer brief on the merits is extended to April 15, 2019.

**S251424****GANT (DARIUS) ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the informal response is extended to May 17, 2019.

No further extensions of time are contemplated.

**S252473****IN RE CLIFFORD ALLEN  
BRACE, JR.**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer brief on the merits is extended to May 2, 2019.

**S253458** B276420/B279838 Second Appellate District, Div. 8 **KAANAANA (DAVID) v.  
BARRETT BUSINESS  
SERVICES, INC.**

Extension of time granted

On application of respondents and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the opening brief on the merits is extended to May 13, 2019.

**S253227** A136451 First Appellate District, Div. 3**PEOPLE v. ANDERSON  
(VERNON)**

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of appellant for appointment of counsel, John Ward 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.

**S065877****PEOPLE v. LOPEZ (BOBBY)  
& TRUJEQUE (JAMES)**

Order filed

The order filed March 13, 2019, granting an extension of time in which to file appellant Lopez's opening brief is corrected nunc pro tunc as to the case title.

**S252849****KEEN ON DISCIPLINE**

Order filed

Due to clerical error on the part of the State Bar of California. The order of this court filed February 1, 2019, disbaring ROBERT EDWARD KEEN, is hereby amended to read in its entirety:

“The court orders that ROBERT EDWARD KEEN (Respondent), State Bar Number 50871, is disbarred from the practice of law in California and that Respondent’s name is stricken from the roll of attorneys.

Respondent must make restitution to the following payees or such other recipient as may be designated by the Office of Probation or the State Bar Court:

- (1) Loistine Drake in the amount of \$10,000 plus 10 percent interest per year from June 22, 2016;
- (2) Israel Espinoza in the amount of \$4,640 plus 10 percent interest per year from April 24, 2017;
- (3) DiMarco, Araujo and Montevideo in the amount of \$27,115.42 plus 10 percent interest per year from June 13, 2017;
- (4) DiMarco, Araujo and Montevideo in the amount of \$9,978.86 plus 10 percent interest per year from January 30, 2018; and
- (5) Jacqueline Maximo in the amount of \$3,750 plus 10 percent interest per year from December 15, 2017.

Any restitution owed to the Client Security Fund is enforceable as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.5, subdivisions (c) and (d).

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.

This order is entered nunc pro tunc to February 1, 2019.”

**S253875**

B284690 Second Appellate District, Div. 1

**PEOPLE v. JOHNSON  
(TARELL)**

Order filed

Due to clerical error, the order filed in the above matter on March 13, 2019, denying the petition for review, is amended to reflect the title above.

**S254123****DYER (JEWEL EVERAN) v.  
S.C. (PEOPLE)**

Transferred to Court of Appeal, First Appellate District

The above-entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, First 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.