[NO MINUTES WERE GENERATED FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2014 AND MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2014, IN OBSERVANCE OF COLUMBUS DAY]

1698

SUPREME COURT MINUTES TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2014 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S084996

PEOPLE v. CHHOUN (RUN PETER)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy Attorney General Toni R. Johns Estaville's representation that the respondent's brief is anticipated to be filed by February 17, 2015, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to December 5, 2014. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 74 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).)

S118147

PEOPLE v. MIRANDA-GUERRERO (VICTOR M.)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Assistant State Public Defender Denise Kendall's representation that the appellant's reply brief is anticipated to be filed by August 11, 2015, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to December 9, 2014. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 240 additional days will be granted.

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).)

S155160

PEOPLE v. RAMIREZ (IRVING ALEXANDER)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy State Public Defender Maria Morga's representation that the appellant's opening brief is anticipated to be filed by August 24, 2015, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to December 15, 2014. After that date, only five further extensions totaling about 250 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

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 December 8, 2014.

S216761

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 November 10, 2014.

S220344

Recommended discipline imposed

The court orders that HUGH WALTER BERRY, State Bar Number 149416, is suspended from the practice of law in California for one year, execution of that period of suspension is stayed, and he is placed on probation for two years subject to the following conditions:

- 1. HUGH WALTER BERRY is suspended from the practice of law for the first thirty days of probation;
- 2. HUGH WALTER BERRY must comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on June 12, 2014; and
- 3. At the expiration of the period of probation, if HUGH WALTER BERRY has complied with all conditions of probation, the period of stayed suspension will be satisfied and that suspension will be terminated.

HUGH WALTER BERRY must also take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order and provide satisfactory proof of such passage to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles within the same period. 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.

PEOPLE v. GUERRERO (JOSE)

EDWARDS (BRIAN DREW) ON H.C.

BERRY ON DISCIPLINE

S220345

Recommended discipline imposed

The court orders that STEVEN MARK BISHOP, State Bar Number 81618, is suspended from the practice of law in California for one year, execution of that period of suspension is stayed, and he is placed on probation for one year subject to the following conditions:

- 1. STEVEN MARK BISHOP must comply with the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on June 11, 2014; and
- 2. At the expiration of the period of probation, if STEVEN MARK BISHOP has complied with the terms of probation, the one-year period of stayed suspension will be satisfied and that suspension will be terminated.

STEVEN MARK BISHOP must also take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order and provide satisfactory proof of such passage to the State Bar's Office of Probation within the same period. 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.

S220346

BORGES, JR., ON DISCIPLINE

Recommended discipline imposed: disbarred

The court orders that JOSEPH K. BORGES, JR., State Bar Number 37812, is disbarred from the practice of law in California and that his name is stricken from the roll of attorneys. JOSEPH K. BORGES, JR., 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.

S220383

Recommended discipline imposed

The court orders that CHRISTOPHER RAMOS MACARAEG, State Bar Number 222120, is suspended from the practice of law in California for one year, execution of that period of suspension is stayed, and he is placed on probation for two years subject to the following conditions:

BISHOP ON DISCIPLINE

MACARAEG ON DISCIPLINE

- 1. CHRISTOPHER RAMOS MACARAEG is suspended from the practice of law for the first 60 days of probation;
- 2. CHRISTOPHER RAMOS MACARAEG must comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on June 18, 2014; and
- 3. At the expiration of the period of probation, if CHRISTOPHER RAMOS MACARAEG has complied with all conditions of probation, the period of stayed suspension will be satisfied and that suspension will be terminated.

CHRISTOPHER RAMOS MACARAEG must also take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order and provide satisfactory proof of such passage to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles within the same period. 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.

S220385

MATAELE ON DISCIPLINE

Recommended discipline imposed

The court orders that ISILELI TUPOU MANAIA MATAELE, State Bar Number 266863, is suspended from the practice of law in California for one year, execution of that period of suspension is stayed, and he is placed on probation for one year subject to the following conditions:

- 1. ISILELI TUPOU MANAIA MATAELE is suspended from the practice of law for the first 30 days of probation;
- 2. ISILELI TUPOU MANAIA MATAELE must comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on June 18, 2014; and
- 3. At the expiration of the period of probation, if ISILELI TUPOU MANAIA MATAELE has complied with all conditions of probation, the period of stayed suspension will be satisfied and that suspension will be terminated.

ISILELI TUPOU MANAIA MATAELE must also take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order and provide satisfactory proof of such passage to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles within the same period. 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. One-third of the costs must be paid with his membership fees for each of the years 2015, 2016, and 2017. If ISILELI TUPOU MANAIA MATAELE fails to pay any installment as described above, or as may be modified by the State Bar Court, the remaining balance is due and payable immediately.

S220386

MOSCARELLO ON DISCIPLINE

Recommended discipline imposed: disbarred

The court orders that CATHERINE ANN MOSCARELLO, State Bar Number 216384, is disbarred from the practice of law in California and that her name is stricken from the roll of attorneys.

CATHERINE ANN MOSCARELLO must make restitution as ordered by the Supreme Court in S191623 (State Bar Court Nos. 09-0-11594 (09-O-11951; 09-0-14461; 09-O-15562; 09-0-16259; 09-0-16858) 10-O-03447; 10-O-09288) and S205042 (State Bar Court No. 12-O-10063). CATHERINE ANN MOSCARELLO 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.

A142326

First Appellate District, Div. 2

IRISH BEACH CLUSTERHOMES ASSOCIATION v. BERTOLI (CHRISTIAN)

The above-entitled matter, now pending in the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, is transferred from Division Two to Division Five.

Fourth Appellate District, Div. 2 **TRANSFER ORDERS**

The following matters, now pending in the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, are transferred from Division Two to Division Three:

2.E059818People v. Michael Mammoth3.E059607People v. Joseph Dorsey4.E059325People v. Toris Tyler5.E059353People v. Russell Bender6.E059721People v. Ivan Robles7.E059331People v. Samuel Caez8.E059035People v. Candace Duran9.E058546People v. Douglas Jacobson10.E059155People v. Jose Bonilla11.E059571People v. Jose Bonilla12.E060061People v. Andre Hughes13.E057751People v. Evan Roland et al.14.E059509Z.V., a Minor, etc. v. County of Riverside	1.	E059678	People v. Elbert Jackson
4.E059325People v. Toris Tyler5.E059353People v. Russell Bender6.E059721People v. Ivan Robles7.E059331People v. Samuel Caez8.E059035People v. Candace Duran9.E058546People v. Douglas Jacobson10.E059155People v. Marsha Esswein11.E059571People v. Jose Bonilla12.E060061People v. Andre Hughes13.E057751People v. Evan Roland et al.	2.	E059818	-
5.E059353People v. Russell Bender6.E059721People v. Ivan Robles7.E059331People v. Samuel Caez8.E059035People v. Candace Duran9.E058546People v. Douglas Jacobson10.E059155People v. Marsha Esswein11.E059571People v. Jose Bonilla12.E060061People v. Andre Hughes13.E057751People v. Evan Roland et al.	3.	E059607	People v. Joseph Dorsey
6.E059721People v. Ivan Robles7.E059331People v. Samuel Caez8.E059035People v. Candace Duran9.E058546People v. Douglas Jacobson10.E059155People v. Marsha Esswein11.E059571People v. Jose Bonilla12.E060061People v. Andre Hughes13.E057751People v. Evan Roland et al.	4.	E059325	People v. Toris Tyler
7.E059331People v. Samuel Caez8.E059035People v. Candace Duran9.E058546People v. Douglas Jacobson10.E059155People v. Marsha Esswein11.E059571People v. Jose Bonilla12.E060061People v. Andre Hughes13.E057751People v. Evan Roland et al.	5.	E059353	People v. Russell Bender
8.E059035People v. Candace Duran9.E058546People v. Douglas Jacobson10.E059155People v. Marsha Esswein11.E059571People v. Jose Bonilla12.E060061People v. Andre Hughes13.E057751People v. Evan Roland et al.	6.	E059721	People v. Ivan Robles
9.E058546People v. Douglas Jacobson10.E059155People v. Marsha Esswein11.E059571People v. Jose Bonilla12.E060061People v. Andre Hughes13.E057751People v. Evan Roland et al.	7.	E059331	People v. Samuel Caez
10.E059155People v. Marsha Esswein11.E059571People v. Jose Bonilla12.E060061People v. Andre Hughes13.E057751People v. Evan Roland et al.	8.	E059035	People v. Candace Duran
11.E059571People v. Jose Bonilla12.E060061People v. Andre Hughes13.E057751People v. Evan Roland et al.	9.	E058546	People v. Douglas Jacobson
12.E060061People v. Andre Hughes13.E057751People v. Evan Roland et al.	10.	E059155	People v. Marsha Esswein
13.E057751People v. Evan Roland et al.	11.	E059571	People v. Jose Bonilla
I	12.	E060061	People v. Andre Hughes
14. E059509 Z.V., a Minor, etc. v. County of Riverside	13.	E057751	People v. Evan Roland et al.
	14.	E059509	Z.V., a Minor, etc. v. County of Riverside

OCTOBER 14, 2014

15.	E057788	Dale Egelhoff v. Simon Bojkovsky et al.
16.	E059278	Michael Bradbury v. County of San Bernardino et al.
17.	E059156	Shawn Bennett v. Rancho California Water District
18.	E058306	Roger Terfehr et al. v. Western Lightwave, Inc., et al.
19.	E059503	Zackary Lopez v. Caring Funeral Service, Inc., et al.
20.	E059691	Benedict Cosentino v. Stella Fuller et al.
21.	E057932/E059021	Niv Benshalom v. First Horizon Home Loans
22.	E060884	Richard Crocket et al. v. Outdoor Channel Holdings, Inc., et
		al.
23.	E059131	David Stanton et al. v. The Bank of New York Mellon
24.	E060623	Citizens for the Preservation of Rural Living v. County of San
		Bernardino; Lazer Broadcasting, Inc.
		-

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. 1,170)

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.)