



Supreme Court of California
350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102-4797
www.courts.ca.gov/supremecourt

NEWS RELEASE

Contact: [Cathal Conneely](mailto:Cathal.Conneely@courts.ca.gov), 415-865-7740

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

January 26, 2018

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions During Week of January 22, 2018

[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.]

#18-24 *San Diegans for Open Government v. Public Facilities Financing Authority of City of San Diego, S245996.* (D069751; 16 Cal.App.5th 1273; San Diego County Superior Court; 37-2015-00016536-CU-MC-CTL.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents the following issue: Do non-party taxpayers have direct standing to bring an action to challenge the validity of a public entity transaction for an alleged violation of the conflict of interest provisions of Government Code section 1090?

#18-25 *People v. Cabrera, S245841.* (H043472; nonpublished opinion; Santa Clara County Superior Court; C1514191.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *In re Ricardo P.*, S230923 (#16-41), which presents the following issue: Did the trial court err imposing an “electronics search condition” on minor as a condition of his probation when it had no relationship to the crimes he committed but was justified on appeal as reasonably related to future criminality under *People v. Olguin* (2008) 45 Cal.4th 375 because it would facilitate his supervision?

#18-26 *People v. Garcia, S245270.* (E064957; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; SWF1203375.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Soto*, S236164 (#16-343), which presents the following issues: (1) Did the trial court err in instructing the jury with CALCRIM No. 625? (2) If so, was the error prejudicial?

#18-27 *People v. McQuary*, S246053. (E067215; nonpublished opinion; Riverside County Superior Court; SWF006085.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a petition to recall sentence. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Franco*, S233963 (#16-218), which presents the following issue: For the purpose of the distinction between felony and misdemeanor forgery, is the value of an uncashed forged check the face value (or stated value) of the check or only the intrinsic value of the paper it is printed on?

#18-28 *People v. Navarra*, S245513. (F071142; 16 Cal.App.5th 173; Stanislaus County Superior Court; MCR030669A.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Mendoza*, S238032 (#17-32) and *People v. Padilla*, S239454 (#17-34), which present issues as to the requirements under *Montgomery v. Louisiana* (2016) 577 U.S. ___, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d 599, *Miller v. Alabama* (2012) 567 U.S. ___, 132 S.Ct. 2455, 183 L.Ed.2d 407, for imposing a sentence of life imprisonment without possibility of parole on a juvenile offender, and *People v. Superior Court (Lara)*, S241231 (#17-165), which concerns whether the provisions of Proposition 57 that eliminated the direct filing of certain juvenile cases in adult court are applicable to cases that were already filed.

#18-29 *People v. Soeur*, S245458. (B270124; nonpublished opinion; Los Angeles County Superior Court; NA073193.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal conditionally reversed and remanded a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court ordered briefing deferred pending decision in *People v. Mendoza*, S238032 (#17-32) and *People v. Padilla*, S239454 (#17-34), which present issues as to the requirements under *Montgomery v. Louisiana* (2016) 577 U.S. ___, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d 599, *Miller v. Alabama* (2012) 567 U.S. ___, 132 S.Ct. 2455, 183 L.Ed.2d 407, for imposing a sentence of life imprisonment without possibility of parole on a juvenile offender

###

The Supreme Court of California is the state's highest court and its decisions are binding on all other California state courts. The court's primary role is to decide matters of statewide importance and to maintain uniformity in the law throughout California by reviewing matters from the six districts of the California Courts of Appeal and the fifty-eight county superior courts (the trial courts). Among its other duties, the court also decides all capital appeals and related matters and reviews both attorney and judicial disciplinary matters.