



NEWS RELEASE

Contact: [Cathal Conneely](mailto:Cathal.Conneely@courts.ca.gov), 415-865-7738

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

February 1, 2013

Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions for Week of January 28, 2013

[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.]

#13-13 *Ayala v. Antelope Valley Newspapers, Inc.*, S206874. (B235484; 210 Cal.App.4th 77; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC403405.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part an order denying class certification in a civil action. This case presents questions concerning the determination of whether common issues predominate in a proposed class action relating to claims that turn on whether members of the putative class are independent contractors or employees.

#13-14 *People v. Black*, S206928. (A131693; nonpublished opinion; Alameda County Superior Court; C163496.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents the following issue: Should a conviction be reversed because of the erroneous denial of challenges for cause to prospective jurors when the defendant exhausts his peremptory challenges by removing the jurors, seeks to remove another prospective juror who could not be removed for cause, and is denied additional peremptory challenges, or must the defendant also show that an incompetent or biased juror sat on the jury?

#13-15 *People v. Salas*, 207040. (B237003; 210 Cal.App.4th 974; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BA284803, BA384164.) 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. Leiva*, S192176 (#11-69), which presents the following issues: (1) Did the trial court have jurisdiction to revoke defendant's probation? (2) Did sufficient evidence support the trial court's finding that defendant either failed to report to his probation officer or reentered the country illegally? (3) Did the trial court's finding rely upon admissible evidence?

###